This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

AH 68HM .

Digitized by Google

HARVARD
DIVINITY
SCHOOL
Andover-Harvard
Theological Library

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER:

EDITED BY

Alexander Campbell.

Periodical
1185,75
v. 6
1835

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation, and tribe, and tongue, and people; saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come; and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water. JOHN.

Great is the truth, and mighty above all things, and will prevail!

VOLUME VI.

BETHANY, VA.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR.

1835.

Digitized by Google

Reprinted by
College Press
Box 1132
Joplin, Missouri 64801

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number I.——Volume VI.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. January, 1835.

PREFACE.

EVERY day's experience developes more fully the profound depths of the philosophy of the Divine Author of the Christian faith. Wisdom, knowledge, and goodness infinite appear in all his aphorisms. Errors of some sort may be found, have been found, and will be found in some of the maxims and sayings of the wisest of the wise men of all times, either ancient or modern; but no man's age, wisdom, knowledge, or experience has yet found one flaw in the reasonings, one error in the conclusions, one mistake in all the recorded sayings of Jesus the Nazarene. Moreover, it is, to me at least, most clearly evident, that if human life were extended for the term of seven thousand years; and if one man's experience were so enlarged as to engross within it the experience of all the men that have lived or shall live in that long period, he would at the close of his life have as much reason as when he first began to think for himself, to exclaim, O the depths both of the wisdom and knowledge of Jesus Christ! How infinite! How unsearchable!

This fact constitutes no weak argument in proof of his celestial and divine descent. We might stake our hope of eternal life upon the inability of man, philosopher or sage, to detect an error or a falsehood in all that is recorded of him. But it was not for this purpose that we have made this remark; we have been led to it when about to quote a maxim from Jesus as pertinent to the commencement of a new volume. That maxim is, "*Sufficient for every day is its own trouble.*" From which I learn, first, that every day has its *own* trouble; and in the second place, that its own trouble is *sufficient* for every day. This I did not know some twenty-five years ago.

Digitized by Google

In the bright sketches of a vivid imagination I foresaw, in the glowing visions of the future, many clear and cloudless days, without a sorrow or a sigh. But I was as one that dreamed. Every day, with all its pleasures and its joys, has had its troubles too.

Though by kind nature happily inclined ever to contemplate the bright side of the picture, the disappointments of every day have at length thrown some dark clouds into all my paintings of the remnant of life. There are no more golden days, free from cares and fears within the horizon of my future anticipations. But the philosophy of Jesus happily interposes in my behalf, and admonishes me not to increase the troubles of to-day with those of to-morrow; but to regard the troubles of the present as *sufficient* without the addition of the anticipated evils of the future. While, then, the maxim of the Great Teacher assures us that every day "has its *own* trouble," it kindly admonishes us to regard its own trouble as *sufficient*.

'When I stepped forth into life, elate and gay in youth,' said my old friend Paternus, 'I saw nothing before me but pure streams of pleasure flowing from new fountains of delight. I was drinking nectar with the gods, or reclining on Elysian couches, feasting on ambrosial delicacies, or walking through the exquisite vales of Elysium in company with the nymphs of Paradise. In the morning I heard nothing but the responsive echoes of the joys of returning day: in the evening nothing but the songs of nightingales, and the serenades of love; I saw nothing on earth but the bloom of Eden—the roses of Sharon and the lilies of the vales. Night itself was but the azure vault of heaven without a cloud, sparkling in all the splendid brilliancy of the countless lamps in the palace of creation.

'I sought a partner for my joys—for cares and sorrows I had none. I found a kindred soul in this aged withered matron of four score years, who now reclines her wearied head on my enfeebled arm. Pharaoh's daughter never wore such charms as she. At the age of 20, when we joined our hearts and hands, and fortunes too, at Hymen's sacred altar—were I to set forth her beauty, Eve would be my model. But the rose has withered, and the lily has forever faded from her cheeks.

'We lived for one full year in an enchanted castle; but our fears and cares began to bud when God blessed us with a son. Every little ailment of his infancy touched our hearts, and preached to us a strange sermon—*that every rose has its own thorn.* When he began to prattle round our knees, and seemed exuberant in health and spirits, our joys were checked by the thought that even this good health and playfulness of temper might betray him in some ill-fated hour into the fire or water, or that some disaster might snatch him from our arms. God relieved us by giving us another, and another, and another, till in some twenty years we had five living sons and as many daughters too. I could not count the fears, and doubts, and cares, and anxieties which crowded upon us as they advanced in years. First our fears were drawn from their infancy and imbecility; then from their childhood and its dangers; then from their youth and its snares; and now from their manhood and its temptations. Even their children, and

Digitized by Google

their prospects for years to come, occasion uneasy apprehensions. For years the sun scarcely rises or sets once without some pang, or shock, or fear; for now we have not less than forty-five descendents—children, grand-children, and great-grand-children, all looking up to us for counsel, or touching on some delicate point the sympathies of our souls. So that with old Jacob I can say, "Few and full of evil have been the days of the years of the life of my pilgrimage."

But to remember the maxim before us: I would say, that our experience approves the wisdom of implicitly receiving and acting upon the words of the Redeemer. In every case in which we can test his wisdom and goodness by our own experience, he is clearly and fully sustained. Ought we not, then, equally to rely upon him in all things to which our experience cannot reach; and obey him, without hesitation, even when his requisitions appear incompatible with our immediate pleasure and the suggestions of our passions and affections?

But the reader will say, 'What has all this to do with the preface to a new volume?' I will tell you, then, gentle reader, that the beginning of a volume is a good deal like the beginning of one's life:—we anticipate much—we promise much—we fear much—we are anxious about much that will never come to pass. And I do not know why it is, but so it is, that I anticipate more than usual, and fear more than usual, in reference to the present undertaking; and lest I should be disappointed, I thought it good to preach a short sermon to myself on a good text; and I thought it might not be injurious to my reader to hear it, and to learn with me two useful lessons from one aphorism, viz.—That every day has its *own trouble*, and that the troubles of every day are *sufficient for itself*, without those of to-morrow.

EDITOR.

The Millennium---No. 5.

The Lord coming in a Cloud.

IN the judgment of the candid and unprejudiced reader, I presume we may be permitted to say, that we have satisfactorily shown from an analysis of the Prophets, and from an examination of their style, that there is a figurative coming of the Lord as well as a litoral coming—that their have been numerous "*days of the Lord*" and various "*comings of the Lord.*" But it has been alleged that the phrase "*coming in a cloud,*" or "*coming in the clouds of heaven,*" necessarily and exclusively means the personal descent or literal coming of the Lord from heaven to earth. Of this we have some doubts. And certainly no writer who has come under our view has convincingly sustained this proposition.

In the good sense of my readers, I may not be fully authorized to say, that there is not a word or phrase in the English or any other language, of considerable importance, or frequency of occurrence,

Digitized by Google

that is not sometimes used figuratively; but I must say, I at present cannot think of one.

The connexion must always decide the true application of words; none of them are by any special law exempted from the jurisdiction of their compeers and associates in construction. I have not found in the laws of grammar, logic, or rhetoric itself, a single word absolute. There are no monarchs in language, absolute and uncontrolled. All words are under government.

There is a great deal of republicanism in language. The word that governs in this period is frequently governed in the next. There are no *jure divino* nor *jure humano* sovereigns in language. All words and phrases are dependent, at some time or other, for their meaning. Dependent are they, too, upon circumstances, as well as upon the suffrages of their companions. Hence connexion and contextural arrangement must ever be the tribunal before which the trials of words for significance must be decided. If these remarks are founded upon the unchanging laws, manners, and customs—nay, upon the constitutional principles of the republic of letters, it is already decided out of doors, by the voice of a multitude, that the phrase "coming in a cloud," does not always mean a literal cloud, on, or in, which the Saviour shall descend.

Elias Smith in 1808, published a volume on the Prophecies, built upon this principle, "That as the prophecies concerning Jesus Christ, from the time he was born until he was taken up into heaven, were accomplished in the most literal sense, this is therefore the most certain way to understand the prophecies yet to be fulfilled." But he adds, "If the prophecies do not mean as the say, I cannot see how they are a light shining in a dark place." As I understand this gentleman, *the prophecies literally mean what they literally say.* An enigma means what it says—the parable of Jotham means what it says—the parable of the prodigal son, of Dives and Lazarus, mean what they say. So does Jesus when he says, "Let the dead bury their dead"—"If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out," &c. &c. But that is quite a different thing from the allegation that *they literally mean what they literally say.* And that is, in effect, the position on which, first, Winchester built his theory, Elias Smith second, and some of your brethren, Mr. Editor, who borrow largely from this modern Elijah, without giving him full credit, (because he was a heretic I suppose,) for their copious extracts from his sermons now lying before me. There is much speciosity in some parts of Winchester's theory, and in the sermons preached by Elias; but while they are both ultra literalists in theory, strange as it may appear, neither of them believes that the Scriptures literally mean what they literally say.

Like our brother M'Corkle, they are very arbitrary in their literal interpretations when the spirit suits them better than the letter. My views, indeed, are, that every thing in the Bible means what it says; but, like other books, it has different ways of saying things. Metaphors, parables, similies, allegories, ironies, and even hyperboles, are found

Digitized by Google

in both Testaments; and every person ought to know that these are not to be understood literally.

But while Elias lies before me, let me give the skeleton of his interpretations:—

"The prophecies yet to be fulfilled, and which will come to pass in the same manner the others have, respect a number of great and glorious events, plainly revealed, and recorded in the Scriptures of truth, and may be summed up in the following particulars:—

"1. The promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, concerning the land of Canaan. 2. The covenant made with their posterity at Mount Sinai. 3. The new covenant which God will make with the posterity of Abraham in the latter days. 4. The return of the Jews to the land of Canaan. 5. The appearance of Jesus Christ on the Mount of Olives, after the return of the Jews. 6. The thousand years of Christ's reign upon the earth. 7. What will then take place in the world. 8. The temporal and spiritual blessings which will then be enjoyed. 9. The holy house which will then be built in the land of Canaan. 10. The flourishing state of the land of Canaan in the thousand years of Christ's reign upon earth. 11. The waters which flow through the land of Canaan in the thousand years. 12. All nations will then meet in that land from year to year to worship the King. 13. All nations will speak one language. Satan will be let loose for a little season at the close of the thousand years. 15. The general resurrection and last judgment. 16. The punishment of the wicked at the day of judgment, when they will be burnt up like the tares of the earth, which will then be a lake of fire. 17. The new heavens and earth which will be after the first heavens and earth are passed away. 18. The New Jerusalem where the saints will dwell forever after all the wicked are punished with the second death."

His twenty-two sermons on these 18 themes are just as plausible as the theory of Messrs. Begg and M'Corkle, though I presume neither of them borrowed any thing from him. That the Messiah will personally appear to introduce the Millennium, he proves from the following Scriptures, which the curious may examine for themselves:—Jude xiv. 15. Zech. xiv. 5. Job xix. 25, 26, 27. Acts i. 9, 10, 11. Psalm l. 3, 4. Matt. iii. 1, 2, 3. Matt. xvi. 27. xxiv. 3. Mark xiii. 26. xvi. 62. Col. iii. 4. 1 Thess. i. 10. iv. 12. Titus ii. 13. Heb. ix. 28. Rev. i. 7. ii. 28. iii. 11. xvi. 15. xxii. 7, 12, 20. To dismiss this work for the present, I will only observe, that no application of Scripture appears more arbitrary than to make most of these passages apply to the commencement of the Millennium, especially those quoted from the Apocalypse. In chapter iii. verse 11, the Lord says to the congregation in Philadelphia, "Behold, I come quickly." This church flourished in the year 90 or 95. In chapter xxii. after the vision of 2000 years is completed, he says to John, "I come quickly." In the 12th verse of the same chapter, he says again, "I come quickly;" and in the 20th verse repeats the same words just at the close of the whole revelation. Now if the "*come quickly*" of chapter iii. 11. and the "*come quickly*" of chapter xxii. 12, 20. both refer to the com-

Digitized by Google

mencement of the Millennium, certainly it will be conceded to me by all the literalists that the word "*quickly*" means both a *long* and a *short* time!

I know not how it is that many inquirers into prophecy give such a loose to their imagination when they speak or write on this subject. They seem to act from a tacit conviction that prophecy is the proper field for imagination; and that he is the best interpreter who has the most lively fancy. They feel, or seem to feel, that, as the Prophet was enrapt by the Spirit while honored with the visions of God, they must be enrapt in imagination in order to keep in sight of him!

But no where has imagination rode so sublime as when feasting upon the Son of Man coming in a cloud, and upon the kingdom of the cloud. The literalists think they have found an irrefragable argument in favor of their theory from the frequency of the phrase "coming in a cloud," or "on the clouds of heaven." That we may fully examine the acceptation of this sentence, we shall first trace the history of *the cloud* in the Jewish Institution.

After the Israelites had crossed the channel of the Red Sea, and begun to murmur against God and Moses, while Aaron was reasoning with them, "the glory of the Lord appeared in the cloud, towards the wilderness." They had been immersed in the cloud and in the sea, and a cloud was their guide towards the land of promise. This cloud became the seat of the displays of God's presence, power, and glory. When Moses went up to Mount Sinai with the two tables, the Lord descended in a cloud to the top of the mountain, and spoke to him. At another time, when the people murmured about flesh, (Num. xi. 25.) the Lord descended in a cloud and spoke to Moses, and imparted his spirit to the Seventy Elders. The Lord promised to appear in a cloud on the mercy seat, in the holiest of all, to Aaron when he entered that sacred place. And very often, during the forty years' pilgrimage in the wilderness, did the Lord appear in a cloud; and very often the cloud rested upon the Tabernacle, and the glory of the Lord enlightened it. Thus, among the Jews, any display of glorious power in after times, was represented by the Lord's "coming in a cloud." It became among the Jews the emblem of power and glory, and it is so used in the New Testament. The same event which in Luke xxi. 27. is called "the Son of Man coming in a cloud, with power and great glory," is in Matthew xxiv. 30. called, "coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory;" also, in Mark xiii. 26. it is, "The Son of Man coming in the clouds with power and great glory." Thus "coming in a cloud," or "coming in the clouds of heaven," or "coming with power and glory," are phrases indicative of the same thing. But as God had frequently descended in a cloud, or filled the cloud with his glory, which directed the journies of the Israelites, it became a figurative expression of a splendid display of power and glory.*

* If any one will be at pains to examine this matter, they may learn that Daniel furnishes this phrase, and that in the New Testament it is adopted and explained. Daniel "saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of

Digitized by Google

Dr. More, in his Prophetic Alphabet, observes, that "riding upon a cloud," or "upon the clouds," signifies "success against our enemies, and an enlargement of power." Achmet, as quoted by Dr. Lancaster, says that "amongst the Persians and Egyptians, "a king riding upon the clouds" is understood of foreign nations serving him, and of his being exceedingly prosperous and successful." Bishop Newton also remarks, that "in the ancient prophets God is frequently described as *coming in the clouds* upon any remarkable interposition and manifestation of his power." Vitringa, moreover, asserts that "Christ is said to come *in the clouds of heaven*, in the style of Scripture, as often as he demonstrates his glory and majesty in the signal effects of his favor, severity, and power." To these I might add the judgment of Daubuz, Lightfoot, Pyle, and many others. But I choose rather to show from an authority that cannot be questioned, that this phrase is certainly used figuratively in the Jewish Scriptures. Though we can find a host of the most learned and expert in all matters of sacred criticism with us, amongst whom, in addition to those named, are Le Clerc, Brenius, Whitby, Hammond, Benson, Macknight, Campbell, Nesbit, all the Newtons, Newcome, and Pearce; yet we rely more upon one passage, clear and explicit, than upon them all.

Will the reader, then, turn over to Isaiah xix. 1.—"The burden of Egypt!" "Behold the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt; and the idols of Egypt shall be moved at his presence, and the heart of Egypt shall melt in the midst of it." Can any one who reads this chapter to the end, imagine that the prophet meant that the Lord would come into Egypt literally riding upon a swift cloud! Let any one read the inspired descriptions of any sublime interposition of the hand of the Omnipotent, clothed as they are in all the splendors of creation, and see whether this is not in all harmony with the poetic and prophetic style. Isaiah is countenanced by David, Psalm xviii. Speaking of an interposition, either in his own behalf, or in that of his Son and Lord Messiah, the Prophet says, verse 9, "He bowed the heavens also, and came down and darkness was under his feet. And he rode upon a cherub, and did fly; yea, he did fly upon the wings of the wind. He made darkness his secret place: his pavilion round about him were dark waters and thick clouds of the sky." Again, Psalm civ. describing the glory of God in the kingdom of nature, the divine Psalmist says, "Thou coverest thyself with light as with a garment; thou stretchest out the heavens as a curtain; thou layest the beams of thy chambers in the waters. The Lord maketh the clouds his chariot—he walketh upon the wings of the wind."

The glorious displays of God's presence, power, and glory in behalf of his people, or in the destruction of his and their enemies, are almost always in this style. Even as early as Moses we meet with this splendid imagery: "There is none like the God of Jeshurun, who rideth upon the heaven in thy help, and in his excellency on the sky,"

Man came with [or in] the clouds of heaven." "The power and great glory" is added in the New Testament as expressive or expletive of this beautiful figure.

Digitized by Google

[or clouds.] Deut. xxxiii. 26. "Extol him that rideth upon the heavens by his name Jah! and rejoice before him! To him that rideth upon the heavens of heavens which were of old. His excellency is over Jacob and his strength is in the clouds." If any one wishes for a full specimen of this style, and for a full vindication of all that we assert in reference to the point before us, let him read with attention Habakuk iii. 3—16. in which the Prophet recounts God's interpositions, or *comings*, in past times for his people.

Having found good scriptural reasons for affirming that the phrase "coming in the clouds of heaven," or "in a cloud," or "riding upon a swift cloud," does not always literally mean what it literally says; but that it does sometimes necessarily mean any clear, grand, or magnificent display of the presence, power and glory of the Lord for his people, and against his enemies; may we not conclude that the literalists err in teaching from such phrases, with so much assurance, the literal and personal return of the Messiah before the Millennium!

But I feel myself more and more disposed, as I proceed in the examination of the literalists, to question all their rules of interpretation. They are not only, in my judgment, inconsistent with themselves, but *fundamentally* wrong. I say, inconsistent with themselves; for while they contend that "coming in a cloud" means literally coming in a cloud, in the same breath they affirm that Christ's "*sitting upon a white cloud*," or "*riding upon a white horse*," (Rev. vi. 2. and xiv. 4.) does not literally mean sitting upon a white cloud or riding upon a white horse, but that these are figurative expressions.*

To demonstrate the fallacy of the assumption of Mr. Elhanan Winchester, who certainly is the father of all the modern literalists, may yet be worthy of six hours' writing. I say the father of all the modern literalists; for I can trace them all directly or indirectly to him. His rule of understanding the prophecies is, "The prophecies that have been fulfilled already, have been accomplished in their most plain and obvious sense; which may serve for a rule, by which we may, *without danger of mistake*, interpret those that are yet to be accomplished." [Lectures on the Prophecies, 1789, vol. 1, p. 31.] A greater than Winchester has said, and on this passage too, "To a person who has thought but little on the subject, this proposition sounds not unreasonable. Indeed, were the statement in the premises correct, the conclusion which follows must be admitted to be fairly drawn. But unfortunately the preliminary observation is completely at variance with fact. The actual fulfilment of prophecies has proved, that many of them are literally, and many of them figuratively expressed. The annotators on the Apocalypse, whatever be the country in which they lived, and whatever the sect to which they attached themselves, unite

* Matth. xxiv. 29. it is said, "The powers of the heavens shall be shaken." In verse 30th it is added, "They shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven." Now I ask, is it not most unreasonable to understand the word *heavens*, in the 29th verse, figuratively; and to interpret the word *heaven*, in the 30th verse, literally? And yet such is the inconsistency of the theory which we oppose.

Digitized by Google

in agreeing, that a multitude of its predictions have had their complete accomplishment; and yet, I believe, not *one* among them all has been *literally* fulfilled."

That some of the predictions concerning the Messiah were literally accomplished, no person doubts who receives the testimony of the Apostles; but yet, although no subject of prophecy was so worthy of a literal and exact accomplishment, many of the predictions concerning him were highly figurative, and this was one reason why his own tribe of Judah rejected him.

But to return: Some of the literalists make a difference between "the coming of the Son of Man" and the coming of his kingdom, or the coming of the kingdom of God—at least, they are unwilling to subject them to the same laws of interpretation; but that the *coming of Christ* and the *coming of the Son of Man* signify either the commencement or the establishment of the kingdom of the Messiah, I think, evidently appears from Matt. xvi. 28. and Mark ix. 1. "Verily, I say to you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." This Mark expresses, "Verily, I say to you, there be some of them who stand here which shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Can this mean that some then present should live till they saw him come in person! And is there any one who will not acknowledge that *the coming of the kingdom of God*, and *the coming of the Son of Man*, are used by the Evangelists as expressions fully synonymous, and that the latter is, at least sometimes, used where it cannot by any means signify his personal advent!

But for the present I will not labor this point any farther; nor should I at this time have labored it so assiduously, had I not observed in all the literalists such a fondness to establish a theory upon an assumption that this phrase does always mean a literal and personal return. If I have shown a fallacy in this their grand assumption, it is fatal to their scheme; for if the foundation be destroyed, what can the builders do!

Indeed, the more I reflect upon the tendency of their theory, as respects the enterprize and efforts of Christians to convert the world—the more I detect its paralysing influence, and the greater reason I feel to examine with more scrupulosity, not only their premises, but the modes of reasoning which they have instituted.

But that I may not only pull down what I esteem a false theory, in my next essay I shall attempt to show, not only what *the man of sin* is, but to prove that the Lord will utterly destroy him by THE BRIGHTNESS *of his coming*.

A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

Social Worship.

IN the religious world there appears a strange anomaly respecting social worship—one which has caused me no little reflection and em-

Digitized by Google

barrassment, and which I feel considerable difficulty in adjusting by any scriptural rule.

All sects have their own tables, called by them *the Lord's table*, at which none are allowed to sit down, save those belonging to the party—none save those who unite to pay the same minister, attend the same house, and acknowledge the same creed and form of church government; yet all these differing and conflicting parties are wont to meet together around the social hearth, or at a preaching, or prayer meeting, and offer up their prayers and praises as an act of social worship: and also join together in all or any of the "benevolent schemes" of the day; and this too, *because they view each other as* CHRISTIANS, who differ merely in non-essentials—as all travelling to the same place by different roads, and expect ultimately to sit down around the same table in the King's own country. To-day around the social hearth, *as Christians*, they will join in social prayer and praise, and to-morrow they will refuse to break the loaf together! What's the reason? Not because they think they are not Christians, for this they have before acknowledged; but because of some speculative difference. Now I know it is commanded, 2 Cor. vi. 17. to come out from the unrighteous, unbelievers, and infidels, and to be separate, and not to touch the unclean, and the Lord will receive us; but that any command exists to come out from *Christians*, and be separate when performing *any act of social worship*, I have yet to learn. So that consistency would say, if we unite in one act of social worship, we ought in all.

In the *Christian Baptist*, vol. 6, page 183, you give five reasons why you "object to making it a rule, *in any case*, to receive unimmersed persons to church ordinances:—

"1st. Because it is no where commanded.

"2d. Because it is no where precedented in the New Testament.

"3d. Because it necessarily corrupts the simplicity and uniformity of the whole genius of the New Institution.

"4th. Because it not only deranges the order of the kingdom, but makes *void* one of the most important institutions ever given to man. It necessarily makes *immersion* of non-effect. For, with what consistency or propriety can a congregation hold up to the world either the *authority* or *utility* of an institution they are in the habit of making as little of, as any human opinion?

"5th. Because, in making a canon to dispense with a divine institution of momentous import, they who do so assume the very same *dispensing power* which issued in that tremendous apostacy which we and all Christians are praying and laboring to destroy. If a Christian community puts into its magna charta, covenant, or constitution, an assumption to dispense with an institution of the Great King, who can tell where this power of granting license to itself may terminate."

Again, (C. B. vol. 5, page 122,) you say, "Christian immersion stands in the same place in the Christian temple, or worship, that the laver, or bath of purification, stood in the Jewish—viz. BETWEEN THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST AND ACCEPTABLE WORSHIP.;" and you make "prayer, praise, and vocal worship, the antitype of the Priest ap-

Digitized by Google

proaching the holiest of all;" and this (as in the case of the Priests) subsequent to immersion. Again, (C. B. vol. 5, page 223,) "No prayers, songs of praise, no acts of devotion, in the new economy, are enjoined on the *unbaptized*. Immersion, next to faith, is a *sine qua non*, without which nothing can be done acceptably." Also, in your review of the history of churches, volume 5, pages 276 & 7, you offer some very good reasons against receiving into the church unimmersed persons; but this is not exactly my difficulty. I shall now state it:—

Is it scriptural, or consistent, for those who have believed the gospel and put on Christ by being immersed into his death, to join in prayer, praise, or any other act of social worship with those who have not been immersed, no matter how good their characters may be? And if so, why not upon the same principle receive them to the Lord's table?

That an immersed believer may and can pray acceptably, and should do so at all times, is abundantly evident; and in every instance when called on may do so, is also clear, because he can pray either for, or with, as he pleases: but when he goes to hear a preacher who has not been immersed, and when he and his unimmersed congregation go to prayer, or sing a song of praise; or when he happens to sojourn at the house of an unimmersed friend, and when he and his unimmersed family go to prayer, or sing a song of praise; whether he is justifiable in uniting with them in these acts of social worship, on the ground of expediency, or any other ground, is a matter I would wish to have some information on.

In C. B. vol. 5, page 224, you ask, "*Why is the Holy Spirit promised as consequent upon immersion?*" And then answer, "1st. Because forgiveness is through immersion; and because, in the second, place, the Spirit of Holiness cannot reside in any heart where sin is not absolved." If this position be true, and if it be a principle leading to apostacy to dispense with baptism as a prerequisite to church fellowship, and that an unimmersed person has not his sins remitted—that baptism stands between the sacrifice of Christ and all acceptable worship, and that no prayers, songs of praise or acts of devotion of any kind are enjoined upon the unimmersed—can the prayer of this unpardoned person, who cannot possess the spirit of holiness, nor a guiltless conscience, be acceptable? Or can we join with him in these social acts?

To say it is not acceptable, and to refuse to join with such, appears self-conceited, censorious, uncharitable, illiberal, and opposite to that benevolence which is one of the primary virtues of Christianity. And on the other hand, to say that one in an unpardoned state can pray acceptably, and should be united with in this act, and not in breaking the loaf on the Lord's day, appears to me somewhat inconsistent. What, then, is the Christian's duty in this captious age? Shall he never go to a friend's house, or to hear a sermon, to avoid giving offence by not conforming? or shall he go and conform, and thus virtually admit their acceptability without obeying the Lord? Or shall he go and refuse to join with them, and thus incur their re-

Digitized by Google

sentment, excite their prejudice, and draw down upon himself the charge of bigotry, &c. &c.? This is a difficulty I have often felt, and I am sure that others have felt it, and many a time I did not know how to act.

Should any, and what allowance ought to be made for the peculiar situation of the day in which we live? That many are sincere in their present course can admit of no doubt, who, through the influence of education, &c. &c. cannot see as we do; and shall we say we will hold no fellowship with them, no matter how pious, humble, and devout, merely because they have not been immersed, though their lives may shame those of many an immersed professor? If the volume of inspiration affords any light upon this subject, you will confer a particular favor by letting me see it, either privately, or through the Harbinger.

Yours in the hope of a glorious resurrection,

ISAAC W. TENER.

Taylorstown, Pa. Dec. 6, 1834.

REPLY TO I. W. TENER.

Dear Brother,

THE question propounded is one which has been before my mind for many years. Like every other divine institution, prayer has been much abused. It is by some made the way of salvation, and it has been even substituted for the sacrifice of Christ. It has had ascribed to it a sort of meritorious propitiatory influence in heaven, and has been recommended to those "*seeking religion*" as the only way to find it. Even Deists themselves have been commanded to pray; and some of them, like Lord Herbert, have presumed to affirm that their prayers have been answered. Volney himself, in a violent sea storm, is represented as praying in an agony of distress—"*O God, (if there be any,) save my soul, if I have any!*"

It is a custom to teach children 'to *say* prayers," and it becomes with many a mere habit to invoke the divine name when in distress. They seem not to have learned that he that comes to God acceptably, "must believe that he exists, and that he is the rewarder of them who diligently seek him;" and that "without faith it is impossible to please God." They appear never to have been taught that "the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord, while the prayer of the upright is his delight." The blind man restored could say that God hears not sinners; but if any one be a worshipper of God and does his will, that man he hears. But they seem not to have learned as much as he.

Promiscuous prayers, and prayer meetings for those that pray to get religion; prayer as a *family duty*, whether the family are saints or sinners; and various other abuses of this institution have conspired to hide from the view of many their state and character before God.

But to come directly to the burthen of your epistle: Social prayer always implies communion. To have communion with any person in prayer and in praise, and not at the Lord's table, has, for more than

Digitized by Google

twenty years, appeared to me as incongruous, unreasonable, and unprecedented as it does to you.

True, it may be said, that the Lord's table is only for communion; whereas prayer and praise are for others as well as for those who unite in them. Still, however, there is just as much union and communion in agreeing to supplicate from the Lord any favor for another as in asking it for ourselves, and as much communion of the understanding, will, and affections—of the whole spirit, soul, and body in prayer as in the Lord's supper. He must be of a slow or feeble understanding who has not learned from the New Testament that the first Christians had communion in the Lord's supper with all those with whom they united in social prayer or praise.

But we ought to pray *for* all men, though we cannot pray *with* all men. Indeed, we can only pray *with* them who pray *with* us: for while I can go *for* you to London, I cannot go *with* you, unless you go *with* me.

I cannot, indeed, unite in prayer with any congregation of professors who *refuse* to keep any of the commandments; but if such persons, as far as they know the truth, practise it, and seem to possess the spirit of obedience, I would not throw a stumbling block in their way by withdrawing from *their* social worship; as they might ascribe my conduct to a species of evangelical pharisaism, and shut their ears against my remonstrances. Besides, if those professors of faith in the Messiah, and who are obedient to the extent of their knowledge, ask for such blessings as God has promised, and return thanks to the Lord for his favors bestowed, I could not withhold my *Amen*. I find the Apostles frequenting the Jewish synagogues, and Paul conforming to their usages, and thus becoming a Jew that he might gain the Jew; and ought not we to go and do likewise, especially as our so doing is not understood by them as fellowshipping them any farther than as they may act in conformity to the truth. If Paul would call upon the Lord in the midst of a ship full of Barbarians, and return thanks for his goodness in protecting and sustaining them upon his bounty, that he might dispose them favorably to his religion, to the God whom he served; and if Jesus at the tomb of Lazarus invoked the heavenly Father for their sakes who heard him, that they might believe that God had sent him—I feel myself authorized, when asked to pray by any one acknowledging the Lord, to pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting. These have been my conclusions and the reasons of my practice in this delicate matter. But if I had reason to think that my conduct would be understood as approving their course, I would not thus act, lest their conscience might be emboldened to disregard the institutions of the Lord.

I cannot treat every unimmersed person as a Pagan, inasmuch as their not having been immersed is because they have been sprinkled; and this is often no more than a simple mistake, and not a voluntary renunciation of the Redeemer's institution. If they have thus erred, I would, perhaps, err more in judging them to be Pagans and in treating them as such, than they err in simply mistaking the meaning of

Digitized by Google

a commandment of the Lord. But in all this I do not indiscriminately call them to worship God in any act of private or social worship, any more than I would invite them to partake of the Lord's supper.

There is a very essential difference between going into a Jewish synagogue for the purpose of converting them to Christ by a courteous respect for the worshippers and their prejudices, and in going there to invite them to keep up such an institution. There was a very essential difference between Paul's receiving the presents and donations of the Pagan Chief of Malta and his islanders, and Paul's asking these Pagans to contribute to his necessities or those of his companions. So I discover a very marked difference between being present in any religious assembly and demeaning ourselves in accommodation to their prejudices, and our calling upon them or inviting them to act thus.

This, however, I have placed in the chapter of *expediencies*. If you ask me for the contents of that chapter, I answer, It is the *moral* of 1st Cor. vi. 12. and x. 23, 24. "All meats (says the Apostle) are lawful to me, but all are not expedient; all are lawful to me, but all do not edify." So while it might be lawful for me to treat every unimmersed professor as a Pagan; it might not be expedient as far as his edification is concerned. In matters of this kind, which depend more upon our modes of thinking and reasoning, than upon a "*thus saith the Lord*," or an express precedent, it becomes us to be modest and by no means dogmatical; and, therefore, I have rather given you my premises, and the reasons of my conduct, than entered argumentatively into the question.

Much as I appreciate scriptural views of the gospel, and much importance as I am obliged to lay upon the right understanding of its ordinances, and much as I may lament the loss which is sustained by all professors who do not understand and keep the ordinances as delivered to us by the Apostles; I cannot, however, regard and treat every professor unimmersed as I do a heathen and a publican. While I cannot, according to the Constitution, receive a friendly alien into the kingdom, I dare not treat him as I would the worshipper of Jupiter or Diana. If I hear him addressing God through Jesus Christ and asking for such blessings as he needs and as are promised, I will rather say *Amen* to his petitions, than treat him as one that says, 'O! Baal, save us! O! Baal, save us!'

In the hope of immortality, ever yours, EDITOR.

To Mr. William Jones, of London.

Letter II.

My much esteemed and venerable brother Jones,

YOUR second question is in the words following, to wit:—"How do your churches act with regard to the admission of *whites*?

Digitized by Google

blacks to the Lord's Supper? Do they meet promiscuously, or is the distinction kept up as in other societies, and are separate tables used?"

To which I reply:—We have learned from the holy Apostles, and even reason enlightened by the lamp of Heaven, teaches us, that "in Christ Jesus there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free;" and we may add, neither black nor white; "but Christ is all and in all." In political society, ranks, and classes, and casts are necessary, and may be necessary to the good order and government of the world; but if there be on earth a spot of ground, on which all ranks and degrees of men, all classes and casts of society should feel, confess, and exhibit that they stand upon equal ground—it is in the temple of God. If there be an hour or a day in which the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the master and the servant should forget all the differences which the circumstances of this life, the artificial and political arrangements of society have instituted, it is that sacred hour in which they prostrate themselves before the throne of the Almighty Father of the whole family in earth and heaven: it is that hour in which they surround the table of the Lord, and express their common faith and hope in the common salvation, and unite in heart and soul in commemorating the love of God, and in acknowledging their united obligations to him that has washed them from their sins in his own blood, and made them all children of God, and joint heirs of one eternal inheritance.

In the secular, and by law established religions of the Old World, and in the humble imitations of them in the New, there is nothing that more fully and unequivocally proves that they are secular institutions modelled after the fashion and in the pride of this world, than the recognition of wealth, standing, and reputation, which obtain in the forum, the theatre, and the festivals of this world. When we see the man with the gold ring and the splendid apparel sit in a high place, or reclining upon his rich saloon; while the poor man sits behind the door or stands in the aisle, we may be sure, as if a voice from heaven had spoken it, that this is not the house of God, nor the gate of heaven.

It is our misfortune to have in this community African slaves—a misfortune entailed upon some of the fairest portions of this extensive, fertile, and highly favored land by our English ancestors—or, rather, by the policy of your government. While we have inherited the rich legacy of the language, science, and religion of England, and a rich patrimony of lands, goods, and chattels, we have also inherited from them one great curse, which I fear we have not the magnanimity and the independence to convert into a blessing. Meanwhile, however, as in the case of selling Joseph for a slave, while his brethren "meant it for evil, God meant it for good,"—many of the Africans have blessed the day and kissed the chains which enslaved them to English masters. They have been made the freemen of Christ by being made slaves to men; and though no thanks be due to them who kidnapped them from their native home, they very generally *now* enjoy more earthly good

Digitized by Google

in the huts of the sons of Japheth, than did their Pagan fathers in the land of Ham.

Still, however, we are not in despair, but that this young, and vigorous, and growing nation, proud of its independence, boastful of its love of liberty and strict regard for the rights of man, will yet believe that God has made of one blood all the nations of men that dwell on all the face of the earth—that God Almighty is *just* as well as merciful—and that it is due to ourselves, our children, our contemporaries, to the perpetuity of our union, to the happiness of mankind, that we set before the world an example of our respect for religion, morality, and good government—a demonstration that we appreciate our birthrights, and that we will not sell them for cotton, tobacco, and sugar.

A number, a goodly number of these bondmen are members of our churches. In these churches they assemble around the same table, and are recognized and treated as brethren in Christ. I never knew an instance in which they had a separate table in a church where there were any white members. I do not say, however, that they fully enjoy in all places that share of respect, and attention, and education in Christ, which is due to them as joint heirs of the blessings of his salvation. The long established customs, and the feelings too, which spring from the American system of slavery, are exceedingly adverse, and it requires a spirituality and heavenly mindedness which few comparatively attain, to spend six days in the week as master and servant, and one day as brethren and equals in the kingdom of heaven.

To this subject there is, however, a growing attention; and as the Christian communities advance in the knowledge of the Scriptures and acquire greater proficiency in the heavenly doctrine, they will more assiduously devote themselves to the mental, moral, and religious culture of those brethren who are politically degraded on account of circumstances over which themselves have had no control.

Your third question is—"*Do any of your churches admit unbaptized persons to communion; a practice that is becoming very prevalent in this country?*"

Not one, as far as known to me. I am at a loss to understand on what principles—by what law, precedent, or license, any congregation founded upon the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone, could dispense with the practice of the primitive church—with the commandment of the Lord and the authority of his Apostles. Does not this look like making void the word or commandment of God by human tradition? I know not how I could exhort one professor to "arise and be baptized," as Ananias commanded Saul, and at the same time receive another into the congregation without it. Nay, why not dispense with it altogether, and be consistent?

If I felt myself authorized to dispense with it in one case, I know not why I might not dispense with it in every case, and thus wholly annul the institution of Jesus Christ. But this is said only with respect to the authority by which it is done. Viewed in relation to the

Digitized by Google

meaning and design of the institution, it assumes a still more inexplicable mysteriousness. Does Christian immersion mean any thing to a believer? Is it the sign or pledge, or means of any spiritual blessing? Is it the demand, or seeking, or answer of a good conscience? Has it any thing to do with the understanding, the conscience, the state, or character of a man? And if so, what is it? If he be as happy in himself, and as acceptable to God without it as with it, is it not an unmeaning ceremony?

But it may be said there are two baptisms—a spiritual and a literal—a baptism in the Spirit and a baptism in water. Paul, however, says there is but "*one* baptism," and that is a literal baptism: for he says, "One faith, one Lord, one baptism." Now if he does not mean a literal baptism, he cannot mean a literal faith or a literal Lord. If we turn Quakers, and spiritualize away the one, we must, to avoid tyranny in language, spiritualize the others—the one Lord, the one body, the one faith, &c. &c.

The Baptist churches in England must, on this point, assume the Methodistic and Cumberland Presbyterian ground in America. In this accommodating age many of these preachers have given up their own conscience to the proselyte. They say, 'We will sprinkle you with water, or we will pour water upon you, or we will immerse you in water, or we will lay a moist finger on your forehead; and we will do it *in the name*, or by the authority of the Lord.' As a Pennsylvania Lawyer said to a client who wanted his advice for nothing, "My tongue, sir," said the Barrister, "is in your pocket"—so these accommodation ministers say to the candidate, 'My conscience is at your will, or in your election!' Can it be possible that the English Baptists have degenerated thus far!—that they say, We have no conscience in this thing. You may become one of us upon our terms or upon your own! Nicodemus was rebuked by the Messiah because he did not understand him when he said, "Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he *cannot* enter into the kingdom of God." Are Christian ministers, then, to ask, "*How can these things be?*"

In the churches that have been built on "*the Rock*" in this country, no one is admitted but those who believe and obey the gospel preached by Peter in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost.

We regard Peter as having the keys of the kingdom of heaven on that day. "*He opened the door of faith*" to the Jews and to the Gentiles; and in doing this, we regard him as immersed in, or under the influence of the Holy Spirit; and that whatever he said on the day of Pentecost he spake as the Spirit gave him utterance; and, therefore, as there is "but one Lord, one faith, and one immersion—but one body, one spirit, and one hope"—as there is "but one God and Father of all," we require every man to pay a courteous and decent respect to Peter—to believe what he preached, and to do what he bade him. With us, in this New World, a Christian means *one that believes what Jesus Christ says, and does what he bids him.*

I trust, my dear brother, that I will be able to get through with all your questions in my next. Meanwhile I must again beg your indul-

Digitized by Google

gence; and please accept the assurance of my unfeigned affection in the Lord. EDITOR.

Essays on Education.

To our Juvenile Readers, the Sons and Daughters of our Patrons.—No. I.

PREFACE.

PERMIT one, who, from the philanthropy which the love of God inspires, desires your usefulness and happiness, to arrest your attention to the subject of the training of your minds, to the formation of those habits of thought, and modes of acquiring and communicating useful knowledge, which will lay a broad, and deep, and firm foundation for your true greatness, goodness, and felicity.

Many years, to say nothing of large sums of money, (the representative of time, of labor, and of life,) are foolishly squandered in the acquisition of that which is falsely called learning and knowledge, which might have made them intellectually rich in true science, and furnished them with the means of being public benefactors had some kind angel directed their course in the commencement of their literary career.

To illustrate and infix upon your attention how much loss the world may sustain from a bad system of education, and through the influence of great names, I will, in this prefatory address to you, give you a sketch already well drawn to my hand, of the dominion which one great name obtained over the destiny of the world for almost 2000 years. I allude to the Preceptor of Alexander the Great, the far-famed and long famed Aristotle:—

"Possessed of a most acute and penetrating mind, and a singular talent for minute investigations, he was qualified, in this respect, for philosophical inquiries, far more than ordinary men. His writings in natural history, in particular, constitute a mass of physical and anatomical facts, which must have resulted from a course of very diligent observations. Neglecting, however, that rigid and exact practical method which is essential to all natural science, too much devoted to subtile distinctions of words, and too much ambitious of gaining an ascendency over the opinions of mankind, he pronounced too boldly on nature's operations, and spent his energies too often in useless or obscure questions. In his desire to set up his own dogmas, in opposition to ancient opinions, he is sometimes guilty of misrepresenting philosophers of a remoter antiquity; and he frequently veils himself in an obscure and unintelligible jargon."———

"His *Logic*, which is peculiarly his own, is undoubtedly a great effort of human ingenuity; it consists in an *analysis* of that process of the mind, which, however rapid, and almost imperceptible, must take place in all sound and correct reasoning. It furnishes the model

Digitized by Google

to which all such reasoning may be reduced, and serves as a test by which the justice of an argument may be tried, if it be ever necessary thus minutely to put down all the steps by which the conclusion is arrived at. In the discoveries of science, it can, of course, afford little or no assistance; and it was the mistaken attempt to employ it for this purpose, that so long excluded the proper method of entering on philosophical researches, and filled the minds of men with mere words and confused notions."———

"The philosophy of Aristotle, which it would be foreign to the purpose of this treatise more than to characterize generally, without entering into its details, obtained the same credit at Rome, under the Cesars, which it had already acquired in Greece; being patronized by both Julius and Augustus. Towards the close of the fifth century, the influence of Aristotle began to prevail over that of Plato in the Christian world. After considerable declining during the sixth century, it again revived: and in another century it had gained such an ascendency, that Aristotle seems to have been every where triumphant. Glosses, paraphrases, summaries, arguments, and dissertations on his works, were composed without end, as if to make "darkness visible." Many of the inhabitants of the West learned Arabic in order to read a translation of them in that language. The Latin tongue was made another medium of their circulation, and they were read in most parts of the known world. Men were every where taught to believe in *matter*, *form*, and *privation*, as the origin of all things; that the heavens were self-existent, incorruptible, and unchangeable; and that all the stars were whirled round the earth in solid orbs! Aristotle's works were the great text-book of knowledge, and his logic was the only weapon of truth. Men's minds, instead of simply studying nature, were in an endless ferment about occult qualities and imaginary essences; little was talked of but *intention* and *remission*, *proportion* and *degree*, *infinity*, *formality*, *quiddity*, *individuality*, and innumerable other abstract notions. The Latin tongue, which was employed by these scholastics, was converted into a barbarous jargon, which a Roman would not have understood; and, in the end, the most sectarian bitterness was produced, sometimes ending in bloody contests, In the midst of these disputes, Aristotle was still the grand authority. Christians, Jews, and Mahometans, united in professing assent to the great lawgiver of human opinions: not Europe alone, but also Africa and Asia, acknowledged his dominion; and while his Greek originals were studied at Paris, translations were read in Persia and at Samarcand.

"The rage for disputation, which now began to prevail in consequence of the spread of this philosophy, induced the council of Lateran, under Pope Innocent III., to proclaim a prohibition of the use of the physics and metaphysics of Aristotle; but, awful as were then the thunders of the Vatican, they were not mighty enough to dethrone him from that despotism over men's minds, which, by long custom, had now rendered itself almost omnipotent. The passion for the Aristotelian subtilties had become so general, that, notwithstanding

Digitized by Google

Pope Innocent's decree, it was soon found necessary to favor publicly, in some degree at least, the study of their author; and, accordingly, his Dialectics, Physics, and Metaphysics, were received into the University of Paris by an express statute to that effect. In England, his doctrines were cherished with as great eagerness as elsewhere. From about the end of the twelfth century, the name of Aristotle operated like a charm; his writings had obtained universal circulation, and, in some of the Universities of Europe, statutes were framed which required the Professors to promise, on oath, that, in their public lectures on philosophy, they would follow no other guide!

"From this period till the close of the sixteenth century, though the authority of Aristotle still continued in the schools, the minds of men were gradually preparing to shake off his yoke, and a more propitious era was fast approaching. The revival of learning in the fifteenth century, the invention of the art of printing, and the Reformation, had done much to prepare the world for that new light which was afterwards to be cast over the fields of science, hitherto covered with darkness, and peopled only with airy and delusive phantoms. A few distinguished men—as *John of Salisbury*, *Gross-tete*, Bishop of Lincoln, *Roger Bacon*, *Ludovicus Vives*, and others—had taught mankind that neither the decrees of the Vatican, nor those of the Grecian schools, were incapable of being resisted. *Gilbert* had successfully investigated the laws of magnetic attraction, and furnished an excellent specimen of reasoning from experiment. In opposition to the system that was held by Aristotle and his followers, which made the earth the centre of the universe, *Copernicus* had revived the ancient Pythagorean doctrine of the earth's motion round the sun, and had discovered the true theory of the planets. *Galileo*, *Kepler*, *Gassendi*, and others who lived at the same time with Bacon, were acquiring a well-earned fame by their improvements in geometry and physics; and the whole world of science already sighed to be redeemed from the darkness of the middle ages, and the bondage of the schools. *Martin Luther*, who had been taught the philosophy of Aristotle in his youth, had expressed his contempt for its vanities, and rejected it with indignation. *Ramus*, also, had attacked the existing opinions at Paris, and disputed publicly against Aristotle's doctrines in the University of that city. Like many other honest followers of truth, however, in this wretched world, which has always loved darkness rather than light, he suffered severely for his boldness. As a punishment for his presuming to question the infallibility of the great despot of all knowledge, in an edict of the French Parliament, under Francis I., the said Peter Ramus is gravely pronounced to be "insolent, impudent, and a liar;" his books are, now, and for all time coming, condemned, suppressed, and abolished, and the author is solemnly prohibited from copying, or even reading, his own works. *Bruno*, *Campanella*, *Patricius*, *Nizolius*, and some others, also contributed their part to undermine the influence of Aristotle.

"It was reserved, however, for Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, to break the spell of the mighty enchanter of Stagira, and to give a

Digitized by Google

final blow to the scholastic philosophy;—to make one grand and general attempt to deliver men's minds from the bondage of two thousand years;—to assert the right of that reason with which the beneficent Creator has endowed man, as above all authority merely human;—and to sketch the outline of one grand and comprehensive plan, that should include in it the endless varieties of our knowledge, and guide our inquiries in every branch. Born in the year 1561, and early entered as a student at Trinity College, Cambridge, this great genius soon began to feel dissatisfied with the vagueness and uncertainty of the existing state of knowledge, the want of connexion between the sciences and the arts, and the consequent uselessness of the reigning speculations as regarded the purposes of life. The more he thought on the subject, the more he was convinced of the vanity of the scholastic learning of the times, and of the necessity of a thorough reformation in the method of treating the knowledge of nature, by laying aside all conclusions not founded on observation and experiment. He saw plainly that a great part of the evil lay in the extensive influence which Aristotle still possessed in the schools; that *nature* and *fact* were neglected for the study of his doctrines, which were the arbiters in all disputes; the properties of matter, and the laws of motion, by which all effects are produced, were lost in useless distinctions and dry definitions; the powers of the mind were exhausted in grave trifling and solemn folly; and the real advancement of human knowledge was altogether hopeless, so long as such a state of things prevailed. A century or two earlier, the contests about *names*, and *forms*, and *essences*, were sometimes more serious than a mere strife of tongues: they ended in actual bloodshed; while the disputants took the side either of *Occam*, "*the most subtil*," or *Duns Scotus*, "*the invincible*," the famous champions of the day; and if the din of this philosophical, or rather unphilosophical war now raged no longer,—if those imposing titles were not now heard which had formerly been bestowed on the leaders of rival parties, such as the *most profound*, the *marvellous*, the *perspicuous*, the *irrefragable*, the *most resolute*, the *angelical*, the *seraphic doctor*,—it was that all inquiry had well nigh ceased, and the minds of men were cast, with a very few exceptions, into a profound slumber, and filled only with the romantic visions of an imaginary philosophy. Such had been the state of things at the time of Lord Bacon; and the brief notice we have taken of it may serve to throw light on the real value of his labors, which had for their object the establishment of a philosophy that is, in fact, no other than the philosophy of reason and common sense, in opposition to all mere theory and fancy, and to all imposition."

My courteous reader, if you are to profit from these essays, you must read them three times before 6 o'clock in the morning. If you digest this well, I will introduce you in my next to "*the prophet of the arts*," and "*the father of experimental philosophy*," who taught the curious how "*to ask questions of nature*," with the assurance of an infallible answer. EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

Reformation and Restoration.

A NEW YEAR'S GIFT FOR 1835.

THE restoration of the gospel institution has been our theme for many years. Some contend that it was restored to its original simplicity and intelligibility when the New Testament, fairly translated and disencumbered from the traditions of men, accompanied with the proper rules of interpretation, was presented to the people. 'This,' say they, 'is not only *objectively*, but *virtually* to restore the christian institution to as many as will receive *the book*.' Others may be found who contend that the development of the various elements of the gospel, and the items of that order of things instituted by the Apostles, contrasted with the various abuses found in the apostacy exhibited on the *pages* of our publications, is the restoration of the christian institution. But some again may be found, who, in their acceptation of the term *restored*, only regard the christian institution as restored when preached by the mouth, and when *received by some persons*. Thus we have the gospel restored *objectively*, *theoretically*, and *practically*, according to the modes of thinking of different individuals. But the gospel institution, if not restored when the Apostles' writings, in their fair construction, were put into the hands of the people—if not restored when the elements were fully developed and contrasted with the corruptions in which they were interred, by the pen, the tongue, and the press—if not restored when simply preached *viva voce* to the people, and by them acdnowledged to be according to the written record; but when *practised*, that is, the testimony believed, the promise embraced, and the commandments of the Messiah obeyed—then the *christian institution* was not restored, *in fact*, until *one congregation*, immersed into the faith of Christ, began to walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, according to the word of the Apostles, having the living oracles deposited in their hands.

If the gospel was first fairly and fully proclaimed in Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost; and if the first organized congregation, receiving and practising the Apostles' doctrine in full, was the commencement of the christian institution *in fact*—then the restoration of that institution to its primitive character must be dated (not from the first person immersed under that preaching, but) from the first congregation immersed into the Apostle's testimony and organized according to the Apostle's doctrine. But still if such a congregation do exist, or did exist, be it noticed that the gospel institution is only so far restored to the world as it has been received and practised by that congregation and such as have grown out of it.

It is necessary, for it is now time, that when there is much said about restoration and reformation—about the ancient gospel and the ancient order of things—that we had definite, and perspicuous, and correct ideas of these words and sentences; and that we could ascertain how far the christian institution is at this moment actually restored.

Digitized by Google

We neither wish to be deceived nor to deceive any individual on this subject, nor would we hold up to the world as a model of the christian institution *restored*, any community which has only been immersed upon the confession of the primitive faith, which is not organized according to the christian constitution, and "*continuing* steadfast in the teaching, in the fellowship, in the breaking of the loaf, and in the prayers of the Apostles."

It is not to institute the invidious and foolish question, What church has this honor? or, Who planted it? or, Who waters it? or, Where shall we look for it? but to call the attention and to fasten the minds of the brethren who are zealous for the restoration and the reformation, &c. upon themselves, that they may learn, understand, and feel how far they are restored, reformed, and blessed with the pure unadulterated institution of Jesus Christ.

Perhaps we have all much more credit with the public, and look for more credit than we deserve. Perhaps it would be more difficult to find the first church, the second church, or the last church which exhibits the christian institution restored, than some of us imagine. But the question which we desire to institute, and which we desire to have debated by every professed reformer and restorer in the land, is, *Does the church of which I am a member enjoy the christian institution restored?* If it do not, then how should it be organized? Wherein reformed? or, What is wanting to its perfection according to the primitive model? This question to the individual members of all the churches, respecting the standing of their church, I would most affectionately and most respectfully tender as my *New Year's Gift* for 1835. But it is not the only one: Another is yet to be expressed, which is tendered as a part of the same gift. It is this: *How far have you, my brother, reformed from the corrupt practices of the professors in other societies*, that profess not to belong to this reformation?

If these two questions (the former respecting the congregation—the latter respecting yourself,) are duly considered, and practically carried out in all their details, in the same spirit from which they are dictated, and for the object for which they are proposed, I am assured that my New Year's Gift will not be contemned.

Give me leave to add, that our convictions are annually more and more deepened from a still more intimate acquaintance with the writings of the Apostles and Prophets—that to be a living, active, intelligent, and useful citizen of the kingdom of heaven, is a more bold, arduous, and lofty enterprize, than most of us moderns are willing to admit. The exhortations, cautions, expostulations, and motives to a courageous, bold, and persevering course of action presented by the Apostles, and by the Saviour himself, are such as to inspire us with very high conceptions of christian character, and of the difficulties which impede or retard our ascent to heaven.

The imagery, comparisons, and striking similitudes used by the Apostles descriptive of christian life and action, when carefully considered may assure the most dull of apprehension, that the obtaining

Digitized by Google

of an unfading crown in the church triumphant, is one of the boldest and loftiest aspirations, and one of the most magnificent enterprizes of which humanity is capable. An indolent, idle, lazy, inactive christian, is an association of words wholly inadmissible in the syntax of christianity. One might as easily conceive of a knavish, cunning, sly, rogueish honest man, as of an indolent, slothful, sensual christian.

I have thought it might be a useful service, and perhaps an acceptable one to the majority of our readers, to set before them, in a connected view, the various allusions to ancient customs found in Paul alone, designed to set forth the arduous efforts necessary to an honorable standing in Christ's band on earth, and to preferment in the celestial kingdom. This I shall attempt in the present volume, under an appropriate head, for the purpose of rousing the sleeping energies of many who are dreaming in their slumbers on earth of glory eternal at last, while they have scarcely *morality* enough to make them respectable citizens of Virginia or Ohio, to say nothing of the lack of that strong, manly, and healthy piety which adorns human nature.

The tone and pulse of christian morals need much to be changed for the better. Unless the disciples greatly excel in their individual characters on comparison with other professors or non-professors, in vain would the tongue of Demosthenes and the pen of Cicero attempt to sustain their pretensions to primitive christianity. And unless the congregations exercise a more faithful *discipline*, and not suffer them who in word or action dishonor their profession to remain among them, who will not or cannot be reformed, the good cause, hitherto plead so successfully, must languish, and be greatly impeded in its march and conflicts with the opposition.

If the disciples will go forth pure as the light of heaven, clear as the sun, and fair as the moon, they will be as terrible as an army with banners. But it is by truth speaking, covenant keeping, and righteousness seeking that we conquer and silence the artillery of the adversary. When constables, sheriffs, and the officers of justice are in quest of the disciples of Christ for their broken pledges, false promises, violated covenants, and other transgressions of political law, the church that owns them may lock her doors and hang her harp upon the willow trees.

There must be a stricter discipline—I say, beloved brethren, there ought to be, there must be, if Christ be regarded, a stricter discipline. There is one commandment you must obey—"From such turn away." 'From whom?' do you ask. Those, in one word, who have the *form* of godliness, but deny its *power*. But read Paul's 2d Epistle to Timothy, especially chapter iii., and learn the character which you are not to endure amongst you. As it is better in the sight of heaven and earth to be a poor and honest man, that a rich and wicked man; so it is incomparably better to have a small church of good, zealous, irreproachable christians, than the full of the largest synagogue in London, of the faithless, truthless, and Christless christians of the 19th century.———May the Lord sanctify us more and more through the truth! for "without holiness no man shall see the Lord."

EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

Paul's Allusions to Ancient Customs---No. 1.

THOSE ILLUSTRATIVE OF CHRISTIAN ENERGY..

The Grecian Games.

THAT our readers may have a full and clear conception of Paul's allusions to the Grecian games, we shall give him a sketch from the hand of a master, and the application of one allusion found in the Letter to the Hebrews, to prepare him to relish the study of these sacred and venerable writings—rich with all learning, and replete with all instruction.

EDITOR.

THE most splendid and renowned solemnities, which ancient history has transmitted to us, were the *Olympic Games*. Historians, orators, and poets abound with references to them, and their sublimest imagery is borrowed from these celebrated exercises. These *games* were solemnized every *fifth* year by an infinite concourse of people from almost all parts of the world. They were celebrated with the greatest pomp and magnificence: hecatombs of victims were slain in honor of the immortal gods: and *Elis* was a scene of universal festivity and joy. There were *other* public *games* instituted, as the *Pythian, Nemean, Isthmian*—which could also boast of the valor and dexterity of their combatants, and show a splendid list of illustrious names, who had from time to time honored them with their presence. But the *lustre* of *these*, though maintained for a series of years, was *obscured*, and almost totally *eclipsed* by the *Olympic*. We find that the most formidable and opulent sovereigns of those times were competitors for the *Olympic* crown. We see the kings of Macedon, the tyrants of Sicily, the princes of *Minor Asia*, and at last the lords of imperial Rome, and emperors of the world, incited by a love of glory, *the last infirmity of noble minds*, enter *their* names among the candidates, and contend for the envied palm—judging their felicity completed, and the career of all human glory and greatness happily terminated, if they could but interweave the *Olympic* garland with the *laurels* they had purchased in fields of blood. The various *games*, which the *Romans* celebrated in their *capital* and in the principal *cities* and *towns* of Italy, with such splendor, ostentation, and expense, seem to have been instituted in imitation of the Grecian—though *these* were greatly inferior in point of *real* merit and *intrinsic* glory—for though the Romans had the *gymnastic* exercises of the *stadium* and the chariot race, yet the mutual slaughter of such numbers of *gladiators*, the combats with lions, bears, and tigers, though congenial to the sanguinary ferocity and brutality of this people, for no public entertainments could be made agreeable without these scenes,

Digitized by Google

must present spectacles to the last degree shocking to humanity; for every *crown*, here won, was dipt in blood.

The *Olympic* exercises principally consisted in *running*, *wrestling*, and the *chariot race*—for *leaping*, throwing the *dart* and *discus*, were parts of what they call the *Pentathlon*. The candidates were to be *freemen*, and persons of unexceptionable morals. A defect in *legitimacy* or in personal character totally disqualified them. It was indispensably necessary for them previously to submit to a severe regimen. At their own homes they prescribed themselves a particular course of diet: and the laws required them, when they had given in their names to be enrolled in the list of competitors, to resort to *Elis*, and reside there *thirty* days before the games commenced; where their *regimen* and *preparatory exercises* were regulated and directed by a number of illustrious persons, who were appointed every day to superintend them. This form of diet they authoritatively prescribed, and religiously inspected, that the combatants might acquit themselves in the conflict in a manner worthy the Grecian name, worthy the sacred solemnity of the occasion, and worthy those crowds of illustrious spectators by whom they would be surrounded. There are many passages in the Greek and Roman classics which make mention of that extreme strictness, temperance, and continence which the candidates were obliged to observe.

> Qui studet optatam cursu contingere metam,
> Multa tulit fecitque puer; sudavit et alsit:
> Abstinuit venere et vino.
>
> *Horat. Art.* Poet. ver 412.

> A youth, who hopes th' *Olympic* prize to gain,
> All arts must try, and ev'ry toil sustain;
> Th' extremes of heat and cold must often prove,
> And shun the weak'ning joys of wine and love.
>
> FRANCIS.

The following is a very distinguished passage in *Arrian's discourses of Epictetus*, which both represents to the reader the severity of this regimen and the arduous nature of the subsequent contention. The following is a translation of it by the very ingenious and learned Miss CARTER. "I would conquer at the *Olympic* games—But consider what precedes and follows, and then, if it be for your advantage, engage in the affair. You must conform to rules; submit to a diet; refrain from dainties; exercise your body, whether you choose it or not, in a stated hour, in heat and cold: you must drink no cold water; nor, sometimes even wine. In a word, you must give yourself up to your master, as to a physician. Then, in the combat, you may be thrown into a ditch, dislocate your arm, turn your ankle, swallow abundance of dust, be whipped, and, after all, lose the victory. When you have reckoned up all this, if your inclination still holds, set about the combat." *Miss Carter's Translation of Arrian's Discourses, pages* 268, 269. London, 1758. 4to.

After this preparatory discipline, on the day appointed for the celebration, a *herald* called over their names, recited to them the laws of

Digitized by Google

the *games*, encouraged them to exert all their powers, and expatiated upon the blessings and advantages of victory. He then introduced the competitors into the *stadium*—led them around it, and with a loud voice demanded, if any one in that assembly could charge any of the candidates with being infamous in his life and morals, could prove him a slave, a robber, or illegitimate. They were then conducted to the altar, and a solemn oath exacted from them, that they would observe the strictest honor in the contention.

Afterward, they who were to engage in the *foot race* were brought to the barrier, along which they were arranged, and waited, in all the excesses of ardor and impatience, for the signal. The cord being dropped, they all at once sprung forward, fired with the love of glory, conscious that the eyes of all assembled Greece were now upon them, and that the envied palm, if they won it, would secure them the highest honors and immortalize their memory. It is natural to imagine with what rapidity they would urge their course, and emulous of glory, stretch every nerve to reach the goal. This is beautifully represented in a very elegant *epigram*, with the following *translation* of which the late ingenious Mr. *West* has favored us.

On ARIAS, *of Tarsus, victor in the Stadium.*

The speed of *Arias*, victor in the race,
Brings to thy founder, *Tarsus*, no disgrace:
For able in the course with him to vie,
Like him, he seems on feather'd feet to fly.
The barrier when he quits, the dazzled sight
In vain essays to catch him in his flight.
Lost is the *racer* through the whole career,
'Till victor at the goal he re-appear.

I need hardly remark that the combatants in all these athletic exercises contended *naked*. For though, *at first*, they wore a scarf round the waist, yet an unfortunate casualty once happening, when this disengaging itself, and entangled round the feet, threw the person down, and proved the unhappy occasion of his losing the victory; it was after this accident adjudged to be laid aside.

Chaplets composed of the sprigs of a *wild olive*, and branches of *palm*, were publicly placed on a *tripod* in the middle of the *stadium*, full in the view of the competitors, to inflame them with the ardor of contention, and all the spirit of the most generous emulation. Near the goal was erected a tribunal, on which sat the *Presidents* of the *Games*, called *Hellanodics*—personages venerable for their years and characters, who were the sovereign arbiters and judges of these arduous contentions, the impartial witnesses of the respective merit and pretensions of each combatant, and with the strictest justice conferred the crown.

It is pleasing and instructive to observe how the *several* particulars here specified concerning these celebrated solemnities, which were held in the highest renown and glory in the days of the Apostles, explain and illustrate various passages in their writings. I will now

Digitized by Google

exhibit before the reader a particular detail of those distinguished passages, whose beauty, energy, and sublimity consists in the metaphorical allusions to these *games*, from the various *gymnastic* exercises of which their elegant and expressive imagery is borrowed. I shall annex such remarks as may contribute to elucidate the diction and phraseology employed by the *sacred* authors. Says the writer of the *epistle* to the *Hebrews*, an epistle which in point of composition may vie with the most pure and elaborate of the Greek classics: "*Wherefore, seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us. Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the Majesty on high. For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest you be wearied and faint in your minds. Wherefore, lift up the hands that hang down and the feeble knees: and make straight paths for your feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way.*" In allusion to that prodigious assembly, from all parts of the world, which convened at *Olympia* to be spectators of those celebrated *games*, the Apostle places the christian combatant in the midst of a most august and magnificent theatre, composed of all those great and illustrious characters, whom in the preceding chapter he had enumerated, the fanci ed presence of whom should fire him with a virtuous ambition, and animate him with unconquered ardor to run the race that was set before him. "*Wherefore, seeing we are compassed about with such a cloud of witnesses:*" whose eyes are upon us, who expect every thing from the preparatory *discipline* we have received, and who long to applaud and congratulate us upon our victory—"*let us lay aside every weight and the sin that doth so easily beset us:*" let us throw off every impediment, as the competitors for the *Olympic crown* did, and that sin that would *entangle* and *impede* our steps, and prove the fatal cause of our losing the victory—"*and let us run with patience the race set before us*"—like those who ran in the Grecian *stadium*, let us, inflamed with the idea of glory, honor, and immortality, urge our course with unremitting ardor toward the destined happy goal for the prize of our high calling in God our Saviour—"*looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith:*" as the candidates for the *Olympic* honors, during the arduous contention, had in view those illustrious and venerable personages from whose hands they were to receive the envied palm, and who were immediate witnesses of their respective conduct and merit; in imitation of them, let us christians keep our eyes steadfastly fixed upon Jesus the original introducer and perfecter of our religion, who, if victorious, will rejoice to adorn our temples with a *crown* of glory that will never fade. "*Who, for the joy set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is now set down at the right hand of God:*" Jesus himself, to seize the glorious palm which his God and Father placed full in his view in order to inspirit him with ardor and alacrity in the race he had set before him, cheer-

Digitized by Google

fully submitted to sorrows and sufferings, endured the cross, contemning the infamy of *such* a death, and, in consequence of *perseverance* and *victory*, is now exalted to the highest honors, and placed on the right hand of the Supreme Majesty. "*For consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest you be wearied and faint in your minds:*" consider him who *conflicted* with such opposition of wicked men all confederated against him, and let reflections on his fortitude prevent your being languid and dispirited—"*therefore lift up the hands which hang down and the feeble knees. And make straight paths for your feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way:*" exert in the christian race those nerves that have been relaxed, and collect those spirits which have been sunk in dejection: make a smooth and even path for your steps, and remove every thing that would obstruct and retard your velocity.

H.

Mr. Meredith, of North Carolina, & the Extras.

NO. 1.

THE magnanimous proposition of Mr. MEREDITH, of the *North Carolina Baptist Interpreter*, volunteering me page for page, and line for line in his publication, on the contested propositions of the *Extras on Remission* and *on Regeneration*, demands my respectful acceptance. Nothing short of this could have induced me to do more than notice, in passing, his essays on the subject. A desire to let his readers hear me, and my readers hear him, has induced me to accept of his manly proposition. The proposition, then, is—That he engages to republish my replies in his paper, and I promise to republish his replies in the *Millennial Harbinger*. He has agreed to give me as much room in his paper as I give him in mine; or, in other words, that we are to have equal rights in each other's periodicals. I ask no more, and will give as much.

This preliminary being adjusted, I will now inform my readers that Mr. Meredith is one of the most respectable and honorable of the Baptist Ministers in the South; a gentleman of very handsome attainments; and, in my judgment, the ablest Editor of the Baptists south of New York. He has written 14 Nos. on these two Extras, and displayed a good deal of sound sense, critical acumen, polemic tact, considerable reading in popular theology, and more knowledge of the Bible than is common among Baptist preachers.

It is unnecessary for me to republish these fourteen essays, as he did not republish the two *Extras*, and especially as we are now to discuss the matter fully. He has full liberty to make what use he pleases of all that I have written, and I have the same liberty to use all that he has written as far as I think it expedient. But that my readers may be fully prepared to give this gentleman a candid and attentive hearing, I will now quote from his last number his own estimate of what he has done:—

Digitized by Google

"As we have conducted our examination on Mr. Campbell's Extras on Regeneration and Remission of Sins, as far as comports with our original design; and as far as, under existing circumstances, the interests of truth seem to demand; we shall now add a few concluding observations, and with them, close the concern.

The principal propositions on the part of Mr. Campbell, which we have examined and attempted to refute, are the following:—That the facts of the Scriptures, when understood, do delineate the image of God on the human soul, and in this way, are all-sufficient for the renewal of the natural heart:—That faith is only the belief of testimony, or confidence in testimony as true—to the exclusion of all direct action and influence on the part of the Holy Spirit:—That repentance, in a religious sense, is simply sorrow for sin—being nothing more than a natural effect of the belief of divine testimony:—That regeneration, among other definitions given of it, is christian immersion—in other words, that regeneration and immersion are two scriptural names for the same act:—That immersion is the converting act—that is, the act in which sinners turn to God:—That remission of sins is affixed exclusively to immersion:—That justification is not by faith, but by an act—a work resulting from faith:—And that the Holy Spirit is not communicated until after immersion. How far we have been correct in stating the propositions and arguments of the author, and to what extent we have been successful in refuting them, is now submitted to the decision of the reader.

In connexion with each of the foregoing propositions, we have carefully set forth what we conceived to be the truth. We have accordingly proposed and advocated, among others, the following principles:—That the facts of the Scriptures, in conjunction with the direct agency of the Holy Spirit, are appointed and required for the renovation of the natural heart:—That the faith of the gospel is the belief of divine testimony, affecting both the understanding and the heart, and necessarily including a principle of *godliness*—of true allegiance to the Great King:—That repentance is sorrow for sin, involving a change of mind for the better, including a principle of godliness, and infallibly tending to reformation of life:—That regeneration is the act by which new life is imparted to the sinner, a product of the combined action of the word and the Spirit, and the parent of faith, repentance, and all other kindred affections:—That conversion is the turning of the sinner, in heart and in life, to God; and, like repentance, is the product of new life—the action of the new creature:—That remission of sins, under the New Economy, is, in some sense, connected with repentance and baptism:—That justification is by faith—not by an act or acts resulting from faith:—That the Holy Spirit is communicated both before and after immersion, &c. &c. Each of the preceding propositions, it is believed, has been stated and sustained. To some we have devoted considerable attention, and to others but little, in proportion to their bearing on the great question at issue. How far we have been lucid in our statements, conclusive in our arguments, and successful in our general undertaking, the reader will of course decide for himself.

We stated in our last number, that we concurred with Mr. Campbell in considering baptism essential to the *christian* character, in a sense not generally held by our brethren. This may also be inferred from the statement that remission is *some way* affixed to repentance and baptism; Acts ii. 38.—and also from some remarks in an article titled the "Kingdom of Heaven." It was our intention to connect the investigation of this subject with the present examination. But the recent determination to discontinue the Interpreter, connected with the obvious importance of having every article in it complete, has induced us to relinquish our former design. We expect, however, to prosecute the proposed investigation, in the Recorder, under some other head. Our examination of Campbellism is therefore now concluded—at least for the present."

His account of my positions, which he says he has examined, may, perhaps, startle the reader a little, as he may not ever have seen these

Digitized by Google

positions so expressed in any of my writings. But for all this, I refer him to Mr. Meredith's conclusion, happily conceived, and as happily expressed in the words following:—"How far we have been correct in stating the propositions and arguments of the author, is now submitted to the decision of the reader." To him, too, I am willing to leave it. But Mr. Meredith's propositions are stated in his own words, and therefore my readers are in fair and full possession of them.

Now, to narrow down the controversy to as few points as possible, and to show how much Mr. Meredith has unfortunately misunderstood me, I will select such of his propositions as I cheerfully admit, and then state those from which I dissent.

On faith we are perfectly agreed. His proposition is, that "the faith of the gospel is the belief of divine testimony, affecting both the understanding and the heart; and necessarily including a principle of godliness—of true allegiance to the Great King."

My readers will bear me witness when I say, that on this proposition we are agreed. I always contended for such a *faith of the gospel* as that which Mr. Meredith propounds.

On repentance, too, we are agreed. His definition is, that "repentance is sorrow for sin, involving a change of mind for the better, including a principle of godliness, and *infallibly tending to reformation of life.*" Here there is no debate.

On remission of sins we are also agreed! for his position is, that "remission of sins under the New Economy is, in some sense, connected with repentance and baptism." In this we are also cordially agreed.

His definition of conversion I also accept; but the philosophy attached to it is debateable. His definition is, that "conversion is the turning of the sinner in heart and life to God. To this I sincerely assent; but the philosophy of this conversion is doubtful—for he adds, "Like repentance, it is the product of new life—the action of the new creature." How a "*new creature*" is to be converted to God, or how conversion can be "the action of a new creature," comes not within the sphere of my optics. My philosophy says a man exists before he acts, and the action of a new creature is not the action of an old creature; and how a new creature can be converted to God, I leave to those nearer the sun for the present.

That justification is by faith, and that the Holy Spirit was communicated both before and after immersion, are also propositions to which I find no difficulty in assenting. 'What in the name of reason, then,' the reader will ask, 'has the fourteen essays been written about, since you are so well agreed? Has Mr. Meredith converted you to his views on faith, repentance, remission of sins, in connexion with baptism, conversion, justification?' No conversion, courteous reader. See all my writings from the beginning. He has only expressed in his own language what I have been for many years contending.

'Can you, then,' rejoins the inquisitive reader, 'find not one proposition in all his propositions exceptionable?' Yes, I can find one, or a piece of one or two, exceptionable; and for one I select the following

Digitized by Google

as most exceptionable: and one is enough for debate until it be fully discussed. Here, then, you have it: "That regeneration is the act by which new life is imparted to the sinner—a product of the combined action of the word and the Spirit—and the parent of faith, repentance, and all other kindred affections."

On this proposition I will offer a few remarks to the consideration of Mr. Meredith and the public. For the sake of reference I shall number them:—

1. There is no sentence in the Bible that affirms this proposition. Regeneration is no where affirmed to be the act by which new life is imparted to the sinner. Mr. Meredith is then called on for the text, the single text, that says so. Nor is there any sentence in the sacred Scriptures that says regeneration is "a product of the combined action of the word and the Spirit." Mr. Meredith will please attend to this, and produce his divine authority for his allegata. Again—we know not the text, the solitary text, that affirms that "regeneration is the parent of faith, repentance, and all other kindred affections." Will Mr. Meredith please refer us to a "*thus saith the Lord*" for this? We know of no Prophet nor Apostle that sustains any part of this proposition. It is therefore only a speculative, abstract, and metaphysical view—depending wholly upon imagination or illogical inference: we say *illogical;* for there is nor saying nor fact in the Bible from which it can be *logically* inferred.

2. It appears to us inaccurate in language; for there is no system of mental philosophy—no science of mind—no grammarian, logician, or rhetorician, that will allow us to call faith and repentance *affections* of the mind. Mr. Meredith will please refer us to that philosopher, or sage, or divine, that ranks faith and repentance amongst the affections; and he will please name the "*other kindred affections*" of faith and repentance. This is a family into which I desire to be introduced—I mean the other *kindred* affections of faith and repentance.

3. But if he should succeed in disposing of these difficulties, and in reconciling me to the new theory of kindred affections, I have remaining yet another difficulty. It may be called a philosophic, or, if any prefers it, a common sense difficulty. It is this—If regeneration be the "*parent of faith and repentance,*" how shall we defend ourselves against those who reason in the following train:—

The parent is always older than the child, at first independent of the child, and derives no part of his existence from the child. Regeneration, then, being the parent of faith, is older than faith, independent of faith, and derives no part of its existence from faith!' Then comes another question, (for troubles seldom come single,)—What has *the word* to do in this case? It must act like a charm, if it act at all; for if it be believed before regeneration, then the child is older than the parent, and this is a lineage that belongs neither to the moon nor to our earth. But Mr. Meredith says that "regeneration is the product (the child) of the combined action of the word and the Spirit." The word and the Spirit are, then, the parents of regeneration, and regeneration is the parent of faith! But if the word and the

Digitized by Google

Spirit should happen to be believed before regeneration, then faith is the parent and regeneration the child! So that to complete Mr. Meredith's theory neither the word nor the Spirit ought to be believed or can be believed before regeneration. And so it comes to pass that a person enters the kingdom of heaven as a regenerated unbeliever!

On these difficulties our friend Mr. Meredith will throw as much light as possible. We would not impose a heavy burthen upon his shoulders at first, and therefore we shall at present offer but three objections to his proposition or definition of regeneration. That he may reply to them in order, we have placed them before him numerically. The *first* he will please remember is, that his proposition is unauthorized by the Book of Inspiration. In the *second* place it is inaccurate in language. And in the *third* place it is most unphilosophic in that it assigns an inadequate cause, or rather no moral cause, for a moral effect: for is it not clear as day, that if the word be not believed, it cannot be a moral cause; and who can affirm that it is, or can be a physical cause of regeneration? All of which is most respectfully and benevolently submitted to the examination of our friend Mr. Meredith. EDITOR.

Dr. Fishback's Book---No. 1.

FAITH ALONE.

"Essays and Dialogues on the powers and susceptibilities of the human mind for religion, showing the necessity of the word of God, or of supernatural revelation to the existence of it in the present fallen state of man: and on many other of the most important subjects of Christianity—by *James Fishback*, author of the Philosophy of the Human Mind in regard to Religion. *Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.* Paul. *Lexington, J. Clarke & Co. Upper street.* 1834."

BY some mistake of the author or printer, the title and the book do not correspond; for while the author gives us sixteen essays, he only gives us one dialogue between himself and John Calvin. But although the Doctor and John Calvin are at war in the dialogue, in the essays John Calvin and him walk off the stage arm in arm, in all brotherly affection. Strange, too, on *the Bible alone for all religion* they are at variance: but on *faith alone for remission* they are hand in hand. These two points are, indeed, the marrow and fatness, the Alpha and the Omega, the soul, body, and spirit of the volume.

Some twenty-five years ago I read with great attention and much interest Scott's commentary on the Old and New Testaments. His preface, however, created doubts on the subject of natural religion: I could, therefore, very easily agree with the Doctor in the first point. The following passage from Scott's preface is a miniature view of the basis of the Doctor's very useful treatise on "the Philosophy of the Human Mind in regard to Religion." It is an evidence also how

Digitized by Google

original minds often come to the same conclusions *without borrowing* from one another:—

"While, however, it is demonstrable, that man is capable of religion, and in duty and interest bound to it, by the most indispensable obligations; stubborn facts, in every age and nation of the world, undeniably prove, that, left to himself, man would never be truly religious. According to the statement above given, where shall we find religion on earth, in any age or nation, which has not possessed, in a greater or less degree, the advantage of those writings, which we will now take for granted, and hereafter shall attempt to prove, a divine Revelation? An assemblage of the wildest absurdities in opinion, the most vain and irrational superstitions in worship, and the most dangerous mistakes, as well as the most abandoned licentiousness, in morals, forms that religion, (if it may be dignified by so venerable a name,) which forces itself upon our observation, wherever the light of revelation has not shone. Nor can so much as a single nation, or city, indeed, scarcely a family, be excepted from this general charge. If there have been a few individuals, who have manifested something not dissimilar from true religion; and we be disposed to allow, that indeed it was such: it must be vastly more rational to ascribe it to the remains of original tradition, or even to a personal revelation afforded them for their own benefit, though not authenticated for the good of others: than to make it an exception to the general rule, *That without revelation, there never was any true religion on earth since the fall of Adam.*

"Men, indeed, living under the light of revelation, and making what use they choose of that light, may draw up systems of natural religion sufficiently plausible, and apparently rational. But it should be remembered, that this light is originally, through one channel or another, derived from the Bible; though too often, with equal absurdity and ingratitude, set up in opposition to sacred and sublime truths; and universal experience demonstrates, that no such natural religion ever was discovered and delineated by men of any nation, who had never seen any part of the Bible, or any thing deduced from that source."

Much reflection and examination have long since emboldened me to affirm that "natural religion" and deism are of the same kidney—both plagiarisms from the Bible; that no man can rationally be an atheist, a deist, or a natural religionist The Doctor has done great justice to this topic in no less than three books at three different periods of his life—one written before his conversion, and two since.

But the present volume had an ulterior object in view. That object was to prove that "baptism has nothing to do in procuring the actual remission of sins." And certainly he has well proved this point. He had only to contend with Calvin's weapons against the Catholics of the 16th century. But why he should devote so much time and labor in opposing the Catholics in Kentucky, I know not; unless he anticipates the accomplishment of all the forebodings of the different sects in this country, that the Roman Catholic religion is destined to subvert the pillars of the great temple of American liberty.

The only thing uncandid in this book, and perhaps, that is not altogether *intentional*, (though it looks a good deal like it,) is his frequent attempts to fix upon the present reformation the odium of reviving the Catholic notion of baptism *procuring* the remission of sins. I know of no Protestant in this country that preaches any thing but the blood of Jesus Christ as the *procuring cause* of remission. He might write three volumes more against natural religion and baptism for procuring the remission of sins, without incurring from us any

Digitized by Google

thing but commendation, if he would not confound baptism for the actual *reception* and *enjoyment* of remission of sins, with baptism for the *procurement* of remission.

We can easily see why Calvin opposed any sort of virtue in the ordinances of the gospel institution, because extremes naturally begat one another. The Pope went for "*works alone*;" Calvin and Luther for "*faith alone*;" Fox and Berkley for "*the Spirit alone*:" but we had hoped that this age of ultraism was fast passing away; but, to our mortification, we discover that the shades, the ghosts and spectres of *Calvin's Institutes*, or *the faith alone system*, are still hovering over the genius of our much esteemed and talented brother Fishback.

A person might as rationally preach to me from the volume of nature that *air alone* is the means of natural life, (though I am sure we could not live without it,) as from the Bible that *faith alone* saves a man from his sins; though I acknowledge without faith there is no enjoyment of the redemption that is in the blood of Jesus. But we do not believe, and therefore we do not teach, that faith or baptism alone, or combined, *procures* remission of sins; but that they are means of pardon—of the enjoyment of the cleansing virtues of the blood of Jesus.

The Doctor is full of metaphysics in his theory of *faith alone*, and clearly shows, to my mind, that while he labors to prove remission of sins, or the act of forgiveness on the part of Heaven, to depend on faith alone, he does not believe his own theory. But by the sheer force of metaphysics, and heterodox metaphysics too, he labors to establish that *faith itself is an act of obedience*. As some of my readers may be somewhat sceptical on this curious assumption, I will let them hear the Doctor in his own words explain himself:—"The *obedience* required of these Gentiles, in order to their receiving the Holy Ghost, was faith alone. And God gave to them the Holy Ghost as his witness when they *obeyed him* BY BELIEVING in Jesus Christ that he had purified their hearts. Acts v. 32. xv. 9." p. 233. Here, then, we have the metaphysical doctrine of *obedience by believing!* The Doctor's good sense, in defiance of Calvinism, constrains him to look for *obedience* as prior to the reception of the spiritual blessings of the New Institution. But his theory of mind and of religion drives him to the alternative of seeking obedience in the act of believing a proposition! On this theory every one obeys the proposition which he believes. What a nice metaphysical definition of obedience had the Apostles in their mind when they preached the obedience of faith! Assuredly the Apostles calculated largely upon the intellectual endowments of their Pagan auditors!

'But stop,' says our author: 'my argument is that God purified their hearts by faith, and they received the Spirit by believing that God had purified their hearts by faith. It is the latter which I call obedience by believing! The second is an act of faith upon an effect of faith flowing from volition; for where there is no will there is no obedience. They believed that their hearts were already purified by believing the

Digitized by Google

gospel, and their consent or assent to that was *obedience by believing!* This is all I can make of all that the author says on this subject.

I do not, however, see that our author's theory differs from any of the seven theories of Calvinism; and in this remarkable point they all seem to agree—that not one of them practically believes in his own theory. While many of them say with our zealous friend, Faith alone for salvation from sin, for the answer of a good conscience—they plead for the Spirit, and for repentance, and for prayer, &c. in order to forgiveness. But this much only by way of introducing the book. There is not to me a new thought on the subject since my replies to Dr. Fishback's letters in the previous volumes of this work. I designed not much more than formally to anounce its design, and to particularize the great error of an attempt to oppose the common version of Peter's Pentecostian address by substituting a Catholic dogma for the words of Peter, and then in proving that dogma by the views of John Calvin and his associates. For my part, I have no more idea of baptism for the procurement of remission, than I have of faith alone for the procurement of salvation. But there are other curiosities in this work which will merit a few words in passing.

EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

ATHENS, Limestone county, *Ala.* October 16, 1834.

THE good cause is progressing in my neighborhood. Between 60 aud 70 have made the good confession, and were immersed for remission, since the meeting of which brother Speer informed you, or within 12 months past. These have all been added to the congregation at Mount Pleasant, near Poplar Creek. The disciples, with a few exceptions, are growing in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

We have been meeting for worship on the first day of the week for more than two years, and can confidently say that the doctrine is of God. At a 3 days' meeting, held at Mount Pleasant, including last Lord's day, attended by brethren Anderson and Griffin, 10 confessed the Lord and were added to the congregation. The opposition is raging; but the truth is mighty and will prevail.

JOHN FAVOR, Jun.

EASTPORT, *Me.* November 4, 1834.

THERE is a church in this place which was organized by John Colby, (a noted man amongst the Free Will Baptists, who died in Virginia,) about 18 years ago. After him the church had preachers belonging to the Christian connexion until the present time, notwithstanding there has been considerable change in the *opinion* and *faith* of the greater part of the body.

Several years since, when Mr. W. W. Ashley was here, your Harbinger was taken by several belonging to the church. It produced the desired effect. Yet every thing in practice remained the same. You know, perhaps, many have fallen in with your views of the gospel who practise the same as ever. This was, and is, in a great measure, the case here.

Last March, the first Lord's day, brother William Hunter and myself commenced in this place to preach to the above church, and the world (or that

Digitized by Google

part of it which assembled with them) to obey the gospel. We were both advocates for the ancient order of things. But we began to develope the truth by little and little—I mean those points on which we knew there was a difference.

The people began to turn to the Lord. In a short time between fifty and sixty were immersed, and the church became more intelligent and more zealous for the Apostles' doctrine and practice. Brother Hunter labored here nearly all the time until September. But commemorating the death of the Lord did not take place but once-a-month. I left here for St. Johns, N. B. and in June got five who covenanted together to keep the ordinances of the house of the Lord weekly.

After we had begun to break the loaf and had attended to such duties a few weeks, there was no difficulty in spreading the whole of the ancient gospel before our congregations, or at least all that was necessary to have men obey the Messiah. In a short time our numbers amounted to about twenty. We, however, met with a great deal of opposition; but it done us but little injury. Hunter's health was such that he was under the necessity of leaving here for the residence of his father in Weedsport, N. Y. I have since the first of October been preaching here.

The church in St. Johns agreed to meet every Lord's day and edify each other, and break the loaf. They are making arrangements for erecting a house for worshipping in. I expect to return to them in the Spring. The brethren there are poor. I received nothing for my services.

W. W. EATON.

RANDOLPH COUNTY, *Mi.* November 13, 1834.

THE reformation is still advancing with rapid strides in some places in this state, though rather slowly amongst us at this time. I returned home not long since from a tour through the upper counties. Opposition, I think, is at its zenith in those counties. Of all the hard sayings that ever I heard, there is the hardest in the upper counties; but, notwithstanding the opposition, during my tour several made the good confession and obeyed their Lord.

ALLEN WRIGHT.

SPRINGFIELD, *Ill.* November 14, 1834.

WE have recently had a four days' meeting in this place. Many teaching brethren attended, amongst whom were brothers Stone, Hewitt, and Palmer, of Kentucky. We had during the meeting the pleasure of seeing ten or twelve obey the Lord and added to the church. A letter from brother Stone, received yesterday, says that he was recently in Rushville and preached the gospel to the people, and that since his return he has been requested to go back immediately and baptize many who are waiting for that purpose. We have the prospect of brother Hewitt's residence in this place this winter, from whose labor we anticipate much good to result.

M. MOBLEY.

SPENCER, *Ia.* November 18, 1834.

WE have tolerable pleasant times here. In this town we have lately organized a church of ten members. In this county we have immersed about thirty this fall; and I believe, from the attention of the people, much more good will be done.

T. C. JOHNSON.

ROBERTSON'S FORK, Giles County, *Tenn.*
November 30th, 1834.

THE disciples here are, I humbly hope, growing in favor and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Our number at the present is about two hundred, and we have but few meetings without some additions. Though opposition runs high here, yet there is one thing I am glad to learn

Digitized by Google

that is, the intelligent part of the people are constrained to say certainly that is the way Christ and his Apostles taught. But some of them, I fear, are like a people that lived in the days of our Saviour—who believed on our Saviour, but would not confess him for fear of the people.

J. H. JONES.

SANGAMON COUNTY, *Ill.* November 8, 1834.

I AM happy to inform you that there was a church constituted in Clary's Grove, my neighborhood, one month since, of six members, which has increased to fifteen—taking the New Testament for their confession of faith—Jesus Christ the foundation. We meet every Lord's day, and break bread, sing and pray, as we lack teaching brethren very much. O that all who profess to be reformers would reform indeed and in truth, that the word of truth might prevail! so that others seeing our love and good works, might glorify our Father who is in heaven!

J. W. SIMPSON.

FRANKLIN COUNTY, *Ten.* December 22, 1834.

WE formed a congregation here in May last, composed of two white male members and two female, and five blacks. We now number thirty-four whites and twelve blacks, and are still gaining ground. We have lately been visited by brother Hall of Georgetown, Ky. and brother Adams of Nashville, Tennessee. Ten intelligent whites were added as the fruit of their labors. Brother A. Grayham is our Bishop. He is an able defender of the ancient faith.

J. M. ANDERSON.

WILLIAMSTOWN, Grant county, *Ky.* November 8, 1834.

Brother Campbell,

BEING well aware of the numerous burdensome communications forwarded you for publication, it is with diffidence I solicit a page in the Millennial Harbinger for this. But presuming it may not only prove interesting to yourself, but also to many of your readers, I transmit it with a hope that you will devote to it that attention to which you, in your better judgment, may think it is entitled.

I have resided in this place nearly twelve months, during which period I have heard many lectures upon the Scriptures, from Presbyterians, Calvinists, Methodists, Reformers, &c. and, to my great astonishment, I have heard but little said concerning "the secret operations of the Holy Spirit," "the Bible a dead letter," &c. &c.; but I have heard language like the following, even from the mouths of Presbyterians themselves:—

"*No man,*" says one, "*can be converted to Christianity only by hearing or reading some important truth contained in the Bible.*"

"*Any man,*," says a second, "*who will sit down and examine the Scriptures with that intensity with which he would examine the record of a landed matter in which he himself is interested, will rise up a Christian before he shall have read the Bible once through.*"

Brother Campbell, you are scholar and critic—can you tell me how this language must be interpreted to make it mean what has been so long taught; namely, that "*the Scriptures have in them a mystical, spiritual, theological, or some other than a literal or figurative meaning*"? But enough of this.

Among the many preachers, whose meetings I have attended, there is Elder John Roberts, of Harrison county, Ky. whom I consider the main pillar in the Reformation in this part of the state. He is a gentleman of but limited literary attainments, but who is well acquainted with the Scriptures, and who reasons so forcibly, and proves so clearly from the Bible the doctrine which he preaches to be apostolic, that I cannot see how any rational being, who will listen attentively and impartially to even one of his discourses, can avoid being convinced of the necessity of yielding immediate obedience to the Son of God. I have often attended his meetings with much interest; but never,

Digitized by Google

under his preaching, have I witnessed a more interesting scene than the conversion of old brother Arnold and his almost superannuated companion, both in the 74th year of their age, accompanied by the conversion of (now) old brother Sewards, in the 75th year of his age. Brother Arnold is a man whose youthful ear witnessed the thundering of the revolutionary canon; who was subsequently engaged twelve years in conflicts with the Indians, in which he received a ball that he carries in his flesh to this day; who has resided in this county for the last thirty years; whose fields have been converted into this town; whose ample possessions and charitable hands have liberally contributed to the wants of his fellow-creatures; who has been "careful to entertain strangers;" whose house (being a large brick) has for many years been open to all denominations of preachers; and whose life has long been remarkable for temperance and piety, he and his wife having been orderly members of the Methodist church for the last fourteen years. But notwithstanding he had listened with due attention to so many arguments in favor of different doctrines and creeds, and had lived a pious life for so many years, yet, it seems, in drawing near the close of life, he was fearful of "making a leap in the dark," and that something was yet necessary to insure his salvation. Under these impressions, at the close of a discourse delivered by brother John Roberts, upon the evening of the 5th instant, in which he urged emphatically the necessity of meeting God in his own appointed way, and proved most conclusively from an overwhelming cloud of testimonies, drawn from the language of Jesus and his Apostles, that baptism is the act in which true believers in Christ put him on and have their former sins remitted, brother Arnold and his aged consort arose and demanded baptism. This, brother Campbell, was an affecting scene—so much so, that the congregation was in a flood of tears—tears of joy, not those of grief. Next old brother Sewards, who had also traced the toilsome paths of life from the revolutionary war, burdened with the sins of three score years and fifteen, lacking seven days; whose grey hairs and trembling limbs seemed to portray him as tottering over the grave, "leaning on a slender straw," went forward and demanded baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus, declaring that he believed him to be the Son of God, the Saviour of sinners, and that he desired to serve him the remainder of his days.

Accordingly they repaired to the water on the evening following, were baptized by brother Roberts, and returned to town, the placid countenance of each seeming strongly expressive of the ever-memorable language of faithful old Simeon—"Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation."

Brother Roberts remained three days with us, during which time nine persons made the good confession, three of whom were members of the Methodist church at this place previous to baptism.

Yours in the hope of immortality,

LUNENBURG C. ABERNATHY.

BLAIRSVILLE, *Pa.* November 24, 1834.

I NOW embrace the opportunity of informing you of the progress of reformation in our county. Last July we were visited by brother Lanpher, who is a very good recruiting officer. He commenced preaching amongst us on the 30th of June. He immersed three for the remission of sins on the 3d of July; four were immersed on the 7th; two on the 11th; one on the 13th; three on the 20th; one on the 8th of August; one on the 17th; three of which were the product of a two days' meeting held by brothers Lanpher, Davis, and Tibbots; on the 21st two; on the 22d six; on the 24th one; on the 29th eight; on the 3d of September two; on the 14th six; which make forty-three in three months, and the most of them respectable men and women. It has been a glorious season. It rejoices the hearts of the disciples to see the veil of mysticism removing before the glorious light of the gospel. The sects have been alarmed at the loss of some of their members, and have uttered bitter anathemas against

Digitized by Google

us; yet we rejoice that we are counted worthy to suffer persecution for the name of Jesus. We want the brethren to pray for us, and for the word of God, that it may run and be glorified.

JOHN JENKINS.

Bledsoe County, *Tenn.* November 20, 1834.

I HAVE attended three meetings with brethren Randolph and Mulkey this summer and fall—one in Roane county, at which 21 confessed the Lord and were immersed for the remission of their sins—one in Rea county, at which eleven were immersed; also, one in M'Minn, at which twelve were immersed. I also attended one in Bledsoe county, at which eleven were immersed. I will further say, I never saw more love and kindred feeling in my life, than I saw at the above named meetings, which makes me look for better times in this country. I have no doubt but great good could be done if there could be some active evangelist constantly riding. But few to plead the cause of truth in this section (I mean publicly) and these poor, against a host of sectarians of numerous names, but all equally opposed to the truth; yet we despair not, for the cause we plead is the Lord's, and will prevail. Some two or three congregations meet every first day to keep the ordinances. Amidst all the calumnies and reproaches of the world, but more particularly by professors in the congregation where I live, there are some of the most promising youths in the neighborhood, whose souls, bodies, and spirits are devoted to the Lord. They cannot fail to be useful if they hold on their way.

WILLIAM D. CARNS.

[Brother Carns asks, 'Why are the holy places made with hands, Heb. ix. 24. called the antitypes of the true?'

Because the tabernacle was the antitype of the pattern or type shown to Moses in the Mount. An antitype is a thing formed according to a type or pattern. Now Moses formed the tabernacle according to the pattern shown in the Mount. Therefore, the earthly tabernacle was the antitype of that shown on the Mount.]—*Editor.*

Shannonsville, *Ten.* November 27, 1334.

I AM determined to listen no longer to the doctrines of men—no longer to wear the shackles wrought by the cunning Priest or the learned Doctor. I have been all my life listening to the doctrines, traditions, and systems of men, and for my life I could not tell why there were so many various opinions about the faith. I sometimes doubted all religions, and even revelation; and, sir, in this I was honest, for I was like the Eunuch before he met with Philip, I had no one to guide or instruct me; and as for the Scriptures, they were buried beneath the mysticisms and traditions of 1500 years; so it was impossible for me to receive any instruction from them without aid, for I was bound hand and foot; therefore I could not exert myself until loosed. But, sir, I am now free, and I have laid my hands to the plough, with a determination never to look back. May God be praised for all his mercies!

J. C. BARRETT.

Kentucky.

I AM requested to inform you that Mr. Jonathan Kidwell, in passing through the vicinity of Owingsville, Bath county, a few weeks since, told the people that he had challenged you for a controversy and you refused, saying that you were too much inclined that way yourself. This has tottered the faith of some, and it is desired by several worthy brethren that you say something about it in the next Harbinger.

S. K. MILTON.

[In reply to the above, I have only to say that no such challenge ever was received; and of course, no such reply ever was given by the Editor.]

Digitized by Google

From brother Elijah Woodworth, Palmyra, we are pleased to learn that a reconciliation between some brethren in Rochester, N. Y. has been effected. May they always maintain unity of spirit by the strong bonds of christian peace! We also learn from the same source, that the congregations in Pompey, Onondagua county, in Cicero, in Ira, Cayuga county, in Victory, Abentz, Aurelius, in Sennet, in Junius, Seneca county, and in Rochester, meet every first day of the week to show forth the Lord's death, and to keep the commandments of the Redeemer: that the good cause is still progressing in these vicinities.

Brother O'Kane, in a late tour through Mason county, Ky. immersed abont fifty persons.

Brother Carman, of Baltimore, informs me, under date of the 18th December, that additions are regularly made to the brethren in Baltimore. The church is in excellent order, having its bishops and deacons according to the ancient order of things. The bishops feel their responsibility, and as Paul said of Timothy, they "*naturally* care" for the church. Where there are no ordained bishops no one feels that sort of responsibility, no one *watches* for the brethren as "those that must give account;" churches without overseers are like an orphan family—they may sometimes *for a time* get along pretty well. But it is not in the nature of things that they can thrive and prosper as those who have seniors under the obligations of the institutions of the Great King, to watch over them as a father over his children. This church now is full 140 strong, possessing no lack of talent nor information. Three were added last Lord's day—one born and two adopted into the family. Most of the precious members of Mr. Finley's connexion have associated with the disciples of Christ. The brethren, we rejoice to learn, are happy in the Lord and in one another.

By late advices from brother Butler, Carlowsville, Alabama, we learn the good cause is still progressing. A Methodist preacher, of good standing, has recently been immersed into the ancient faith, and is likely to be a useful auxiliary.

EDITOR.

Licensed Slanderers.

WHILE I am willing to acknowledge that amongst the Clergy of different names, there are many who fear God, speak the truth as far as they know it, and are constitutionally what we call good men, honest and upright citizens—I am compelled to regard many of them as men of no moral principle. Of this class are all those who "profane the sacred desk," who abuse the laws which protect them from interruption, standing before the people, panoplied by the sanctity of their profession, by the pulpit and by the law, uttering slanders and falsehoods, when they ought (if true to their profession) be preaching Christ to the people.

The falsehoods that come to my eyes in letters, and to my ears from verbal reports, which have been uttered *between prayers* by the preachers of some sects in this country concerning myself and my views, would, perhaps, annually fill a volume. For a long time I have paid no attention to them—sometimes striving to believe or think that their sayings were much exaggerated; and again reconciling myself to it on the ground that it was a part of "the sufferings of the gospel," of which it was my duty, and indeed, my honor, to be a partaker. And when I recollect that men, to whom I am not worthy to be compared, were represented to be "the very offscourings

Digitized by Google

of the earth and the filth of all things," teachers of error, schismatics, demoralizers, affirming that men ought to do evil that good might come, I have been reconciled to my lot, and am even consoled at the thought of suffering reproach for his name.

But I am so often written to about their sayings and affirmations, that I am obliged either to wound my brethren or to allude to this unpleasant theme. I have now before me several letters of this sort—one from Madison, Indiana, of the 8th ultimo, wishing me to notice the gospel of a certain Mr. Wood, a Methodist preacher of that vicinity, who, from *the sacred desk*, has affirmed, if my informant is not mistaken, that I teach "that the blood of Christ is of no more avail than the blood of any man," in the affair of remission: that "his blood, shed many thousand miles from Indiana, has been dried up in the earth, and never could be of any use to the people in this country," &c. &c. Another writes me from the mountains of Pennsylvania, that some Presbyterian Clergyman preaches that I "was educated in Jefferson College, Pa., and never satisfied the claims due for my education there," &c. Shall I, then, be permitted just to say that these are falsehoods: that I never received a lesson in an *American* College. I need not say that the assertions of Mr. Wood are too absurd to need any denial on my part. These are the means of salvation held forth to keep the people under the control of these sects; for surely no man who fears God could imagine that these falsehoods could answer any other purpose. EDITOR.

MORMONISM UNVEILED.

'Mormonism Unveiled, or a faithful account of that singular imposition and delusion, from its rise to the present time; with sketches of the characters of the propagators, and a full detail of the manner in which the GOLDEN BIBLE was brought before the world. To which are added, inquiries into the probability that the historical part of the said Bible was written by one *Solomon Spalding*, more than twenty years ago, and by him intended to have been published as a romance.—By E. D. HOWE: Painesville, Ohio. Printed and published by the author. 1834."

WE feel authorized to say, from the perusal which we have bestowed upon this work, that the title-page is no *false flag* or *deceitful label*, but that it is as *honest a face* as is generally to be met before a *preface* in any of the publications of the present day. Great labor, and care, and solicitude have been bestowed by its author upon the question of the 'Golden Bible,' and the facts involved in the history of this most impudent and atheistical affair.

No man, *not already duped*, who has the half of five grains of common sense, can read this narrative of Mormonism without being converted to the belief that *Joseph Smith* and his colleagues in the plot are a band of the most unprincipled deceivers that ever disgraced any age or nation, and that his followers are a set of superlative fanatics. This book furnishes demonstration not to be questioned of two singular problems in the history of man—

1st. *That fanaticism is a mental distemper, more incurable than the leprosy.* And,

2d. *That the more glaring and shameless the absurdity, the more determined and irreclaimable its dupes.*

Digitized by Google

Perhaps we were too sanguine when we thought that the fable was so barefaced that it could not stand upon its legs or palms in the face of day and the American people; but it appears that there are some great knaves, some as great simpletons, and some as dark spots in the United States as in any land on earth; and therefore it is necessary that this book of facts and good arguments should be thrown in the way of this deceived and deceiving band of impostors. I wish it could *pioneer* the way of the Mormons; for if once the delusion is tasted, there is little or no hope. The waters of Lethe in their fabled powers of stupefaction, were not half so efficient as the infatuations of Mormonism. The *humane* part of the community are, and I doubt not will, feel themselves indebted to Mr. Howe for the labor and expense incurred by him in the detection of this fraud.

EDITOR.

OBITUARY NOTICES.

WE have always been reluctant, indeed rather adverse, to occupy much room in our pages with obituary notices. Many have been forwarded which we could not consistently publish. Simply to notice the demise of a brother is no great compliment, especially in a work which circulates through the whole United States, and beyond their jurisdiction, and as perhaps not ten subscribers, in many instances, had any acquaintance with the person deceased. Besides, it is thought that a sort of biographical sketch, or memoir, or an elegy, or a eulogium should accompany such notices to make them respectful. We foresaw at an early period of our editorial career, that if we commenced a chapter of this sort it would become a very large one after a while, and that it would be unnecessarily taxing our patrons. That the demise of some individuals, however, as matter of history, ought to be noticed, we never doubted. Besides, our own sympathies on some occasions, have occasioned a suspension or a transgression of the law proposed to ourselves. Finding, however, that in the New Testament we have some obituary notices, and feeling it necessary on some occasions as matter of history, and sometimes from the sympathies of our personal knowledge of the deceased, to record their demise, we have concluded after the publication of the two notices in this number, to adopt the following rules:—The decease of private persons, whose relatives may wish it, shall simply be published in one line or two. Of public persons, a notice such as we think may be satisfactory to the public. To avoid the occasion of any offence, or apparent neglect, we have published the rules which are to govern us in future.

EDITOR.

STEUBENVILLE, *Ohio*, December 14, 1834.

Brother Campbell,

MY DEAR SIR—Mine is not the painful task to relate circumstances attending the mournful exit of an Altamont, but to give you an account of one who departed this life in the hope of a glorious resurrection. Our beloved brother JOSEPH GASTON has joined the armies above. His death, which occurred on Saturday, the 6th ult., although an irreparable loss, was attended with evidences so demonstrative of his acceptance with God, that consolation to his amiable and affectionate companion was mingled in her bitter cup of affliction. Encouragement also was given to the disciples to persevere in the race set before them, and to sinners a warning to flee for refuge and escape the wrath to come. We cannot say with the poet—

"When past the shaft, no mark the sky retains;
The parted wave, no furrow from the keel:
So dies in human hearts the thoughts of death."

A death so triumphant, and attended with circumstances so impressive to saints and sinners, cannot soon be forgotten.

Digitized by Google

My object is not simply to give an account or relation of a man's death, (for this is a common occurrence,) but an exhortation from a dying man, delivered with emphasis and great animation, in a sonorous voice, with apparent ease, and at a time when we expected each breath to be his last, is very unusual and extraordinary; and the more so as his breathing was very laborious, and he had lain some time unable to speak or to lift his hands. While he lay in this situation he began to smile expressively, and exclaim in a feeble voice, "Glory to God! O! my Saviour! thou hast delivered me!" His eyes, which were apparently set in death, beamed with an expression which language cannot describe. He continued in these exclamations a few minutes, when his voice became shrill and his respiration easy. He then addressed us thus:—"*My friends*, a dying man could not do as I am doing—this strength is not my own—the hand of the Lord is in this matter. He has enabled me in this last extremity to bear witness to the truth. The Devil tempted me and tried me, but the Lord vanquished him and gave me the victory. People have called me a *mud-dabbler*, but that matters not to me; the Lord will recompense them. I plead for the ancient gospel—for faith, repentance, baptism for the remission of sins in my life, *and I plead for it in my death.*" Then observing some present who had not obeyed the gospel, he exclaimed, "Oh! sinners, tremble for that which awaits you, if you refuse to obey the Lord. Let not tradition deceive you. I tried it, but it would not save me—nothing but the gospel will save us—believe and obey it—it means what it says. If you do not repent and be *immersed* in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, God will sweep you off with the besom of destruction. Go, tell your parents; and, parents, tell your children these things—tell them to the neighborhood—tell them to the *territory*. Try by some means to get the people out to hear the gospel." He spoke in this way during twenty minutes—using his hands with freedom. At the close his children were brought, whom he embraced affectionately. His respiration became laborious as before, his hands fell useless by his sides, and he expired in ten minutes.

If any should doubt the correctness of this statement, there were a number of witnesses present who can attest its truth. I have not given all that he said; but so far as I have gone I have endeavored to quote his own words. A man may, I believe, even on a death bed, deceive himself and others; but there can be no deception in this instance. Our brother had repented before he came to his death bed—had obeyed the gospel, and lived a life of faith in Jesus Christ. He sleeps in peace and rests from all his toils. This is a soothing reflection to his surviving friends, and encouraging to the disciples who imitate his exemplary life.———Yours in the blessed hope,

P. G. YOUNG.

P. S. Brother Gaston, before his decease, requested me to write to you. I have fulfilled my promise, without indulging in many reflections. I leave these to be made by one more competent than myself to do justice to the subject.

Our deceased and much beloved brother Gaston was amongst the first who began to emphasise in his preachings on baptism for the remission of sins. He lived in the vicinity of the Mahoning Association at the time that our much esteemed and greatly beloved brother Scott was appointed to labor as an evangelist in the year 1827, and took part with him in preaching the word and in calling upon the convicted promptly to obey the gospel.

He, on hearing the original gospel clearly and ably propounded, immediately threw all his influence into that scale, and continued till the day of his death not only unshaken, but zealous in the cause.

Great reliance is sometimes placed upon the last views and sayings of good men, and a degree of authority is by many attached to them, which is not awarded them on other occasions. While we rejoice to see that in the last moments of his life our brother triumphed in faith and hope, we would not be understood as deriving any evidence for the truth of our views, or any argument to enforce them, from such occurrences. We rest upon higher evidence

Digitized by Google

and more authoritative arguments than these—the testimony of Prophets and Apostles, confirmed by the Holy Spirit. We pray that the blessing of him who "executeth judgment for the fatherless and the widow," may rest upon the widow and the fatherless children of our deceased brother! *Editor.*

JOSEPH HELM, Sen. of Lincoln county, Kentucky, crossed the Jordan on the 10th day of May last, with Canaan in his eye, full of faith, zeal, and courage. He was a veteran in the Army of the Faith, having stood in the ranks for full *sixty-six years*. Early after the proclamation of the Restoration in Kentucky he volunteered on the side of the Apostles against the Man of Sin, and threw the weight of his influence and his example on the side of Reformation. And this was not a small offering—being the father of *twenty-one* living children, and consequently a patriarch amongst his own descendants and connexions. He wanted but one year of *four score*. The Lord blessed him with many children, many friends, many earthly bounties, and with many years—and best of all, with the hope, sure and steadfast, of a glorious immortality. His amiable and faithful companion still survives him. May her end, like his, be peace! EDITOR.

INCONSISTENCY.

JAMESTOWN, Ohio, December 15, 1834.

Dear brother Campbell,

THE pretended friends of a cause always do more injury to it than the open enemies. The cause of Jesus Christ has more pretended friends than any other cause; but there are many who do all they can to prevent men from obeying Jesus, who at the same time make loud professions of friendship for him. Among the number may be counted all who advocate "*faith alone*" for salvation. I have never seen one of these "faith alone" men but that he was disobedient himself, and endeavored to make others so. Besides, I never saw one who made such profession, but who also said much about the Holy Ghost. Ask any of them if they consider the Holy Ghost necessary to salvation, and they answer, Yes. Thus they contradict their "faith alone" theory, and make something else than faith necessary to salvation. But of all absurdities taught, there is nothing more absurd than for a "faith alone" man to teach repentance. To repent for that which has already been forgiven, or to repent of sins after they have been pardoned, is what I should call *the pinnacle of absurdity*. To teach baptism for the purpose of entering the church or kingdom of God, would not be half as absurd in a "faith alone" man, as to teach repentance for sins. And to speak of repentance before faith, as some do, is to make the knowledge of sin precede the knowledge of law. It is to make men repent of sins before they know that they have sinned. So that this evasion does not help them out of the absurdity.

I do not like to judge or censure men, but I cannot help believing that there are some men who know more than I do, and who can see the absurdity of such a course, who still persist in teaching the absurdities above pointed out. Can it be possible that they have a clear conscience in doing so? But I will no judge lest I be judged. For it is *possible* that up to this time they have been blinded by tradition as was Saul of Tarsus.

There are none of the advocates of "faith alone" who have ventured to assert that repentance and baptism will invalidate faith. Therefore, those who advocate faith, repentance, and baptism as prerequisites for forgiveness stand uncondemned by the teachers of "faith alone."

There are some who harp constantly on repentance, as though God had given no other command; but he who goes for faith, repentance, and baptism, escapes condemnation by them also. But he that adds baptism to faith and repentance for remission of sins, is a *Campbellite*, even if he were the Apostle

Digitized by Google

Peter or the Apostle Paul; and he is exceedingly uncharitable, for he by his doctrine condemns all the "faith alone" men, and all who harp on repentance, and refuse baptism.

As ever yours,

M. WINANS.

QUERY.

BY what authority did the Apostles ordain Matthias to the Apostleship? Did he or Paul fill the twelfth throne? *Alabama.*

Answer.—By the commandment of the Holy Spirit in the mouth of David, who said, "*And his office let another take.*" This is the authority, Peter being competent to rightly interpret that plain commandment. Paul's call and mission were primarily to the Gentiles. He preached sometimes to the Jews, though not sent primarily to them—just as he sometimes immersed, though not sent primarily to do that work—for while it was named in the commission of the Twelve, it was not once named in Paul's commission. Yet Paul sometimes preached to the Jews, and sometimes he immersed when he could find no deacon or minister to wait upon him. EDITOR.

☞ S. M. M'CORKLE, in defence of his views against the *Reformed Clergyman*, No. 1, has been received. As the Reformed Clergyman has intimated in his 5th No. (received) that he will make a pause in his series after the 8th number, for the purpose of a reply from any quarter, we judge it most for edification to defer the publication of any thing in reply till he has opened his views more fully. We would also recommend, in conformity to an intimation from the *Reformed Clergyman*, that an issue be joined on some one point of defence or oppugnation. And as brother M'Corkle will have it wholly at his option to select the issue he will make, whether in defence of some leading point or points in his own expose, or in opposition to some leading point or points on the other side, we would advise him to digest well the 6th No. of the Reformed Clergyman, and then to concentrate his powers on such cardinal points as will sustain himself, or sap the foundation of the opposite theory. EDITOR.

STANZAS,

BY MRS. L. H. SIGOURNEY.

Unto him who loved us, and gave himself for us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood. REVELATION.

HOW HATH HE LOV'D US?—Ask the star
That on its wond'rous mission sped,
Hung trembling o'er that manger scene
Where he, Messiah, bow'd his head;
He, who of earth doth seal the doom,
Found in her lowliest inn—NO ROOM.

Judea's mountains, lift your voice,
With legends of the Saviour fraught;
Speak, favor'd Olivet, so oft
At midnight's prayerful vigil sought—
And Cedron's brook, whose rippling wave
Frequent his weary feet did lave.

How hath he lov'd us? Ask the band
That fled his woes with breathless haste—
Ask the weak friend's denial tone,
Scarce by his bitterest tears effac'd;
Ask the traitor's kiss—and see
What Jesus hath endur'd for thee.

Ask of Gethsemane, whose dews
Shrunk from that moisture strangely red,
Which in that unwatch'd hour of pain
His agonizing temples shed!
The scourge, the thorn, whose anguish sore,
Like the unanswering lamb he bore.

How hath he lov'd us? Ask the cross,
The Roman spear, the shrouded sky;
Ask of the sheeted dead, who burst
Their cerements at his fearful cry.
O! ask no more; but bow thy pride,
And yield thy heart to him who di'd.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number II.——Volume VI.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. February, 1835.

Mistranslations---No. 1.

MISTRANSLATIONS of the Scriptures have, in some instances, created doubts—in many instances, confirmed doubts in the inspiration of the Scriptures—and Sceptics have armed themselves with these errors of translators, and turned them against the *inspired authors* of the volume. Christians also have been sometimes bewildered in error, and their progress in the knowledge of the communications of the Good Spirit greatly impeded by these mistranslations.

I commence this series of essays not knowing where it may end; but my object is to afford some evidence that many of the objections of the Sceptics, many of the difficulties of Christians, vanish immediately in the presence of a correct translation.

Our most approved biblical critics commend the common version of the Old Testament, and also that of the New—it appears to me, as much through cowardice as conviction; for they all find much fault with it. I know few writers who have said more in favor of the common version than Adam Clark and T. H. Horne, and few men have convicted the translation of more or greater errors than they. I will only attend to those of some importance in this series of essays; and soon as I shall have gone through the book of Genesis, I may, perhaps, take up some book of the New Testament. For the sake of future reference, I shall enumerate them.

Mistranslation 1. Gen. i. 6. "And God said, Let there be a *firmament* in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters."

The King's translators here followed the Vulgate, or old Latin version, which followed the Septuagint more than the Hebrew. The Latin *firmamentum*, and the Septuagint *stereooma*, do not, in the judg-

Digitized by Google

ment of the best Hebrew scholars, fairly translate the original *rakeea.* This being derived from the Hebrew word *raka,* (to spread, to expand,) properly signifies *the expanse,* or *space.* The word *firmament* countenances the Greek philosophy much more than the true philosophy of Moses. The Greeks had an idea of a solid firmament in which the stars were *placed;* and, perhaps, too great leaning to that notion influenced the Seventy in making a version for Ptolemy Philadelphus. However, the laugh of the modern philosophists against the "studded firmament" of Moses, is only against the solid *firmament* of their own Greek Atheists; for Moses teaches the true wisdom, saying, "And God said, Let there be an expanse [or space, or atmosphere,] in the midst of the waters, and let it separate the waters from the waters." And let me ask the wise Sceptics of this enlightened age, Does not the circumambient air, this expanded fluid, separate the waters of the sea, &c. from the waters which float above us in vapors and clouds? The word *expanse,* in its full latitude, includes the whole ethereal regions, and while it sometimes refers to the atmosphere, properly so called, in its full import it includes the whole space filled by air and ether. No word could then be more proper than the word *expanse,* which gives to the English reader the whole premises which the original presented to the Hebrew reader.

Mistranslation 2. verse 16. "And God made two great lights: the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night."

The Sceptic exclaims, 'Fine philosophy, Moses! You call the moon a great light. Now we know that she is an *opaque* body, and shines only by a light *borrowed* from the sun. And this is not the greatest error in your narrative; for you make *light* four days older than the *sun,* the fountain of *light!!!*'

Stop, Mr. Sceptic: Moses is not to blame. He is rather in advance of even the discoveries of Newton. He calls not the sun himself a *light*—he only calls him a *light-bearer.* He made two great light-bearers, or *luminaries.* "*Great,*" relative to our earth!

Let us now examine this matter a little more learnedly and philosophically, if you please. In the 3d verse we are told that God said, "Let there be *light,* and there was light." The original words are, YEHI AUR, VA YEHI AUR. *Aur* signifies both light, caloric, fire, electricity. Job xxxvii. 3. iti s rendered *lightning.* Ezekiel v. 2. *fire.* Isaiah xliv. 16. *heat.* Now of these, *light* is the best general term; for that there is more *latent* light than latent heat in the material universe, is acknowledged by all philosophers of the modern school. When, then, the Hebrew word *aur* is properly understood, I prefer to render Gen. i. 3. "God said, *Let there be light,*"—to, Let there be *electricity;* or, Let there be *fire;* or, Let there be *caloric;* for light is more simple, intelligible, beautiful, and characteristic, than any of them. But my censure of the King's translators is, that while *Moses changes the word in the 16th verse, they keep to the word found in the 3d verse.* In the 3d verse it is *aur,* which the Septuagint renders *phos,* the Latins *lux,* and the common version *light.* But in the 14th and 16th verses it is *mart,* which in the Septuagint is translated

Digitized by Google

phosteres, and in the Vulgate *luminaria*. Now while *aur* denotes that subtle elastic fluid called *light*, *mart* denotes the instruments or the means called *bodies*, which reflect or carry that light to the earth. The 14th verse and the 16th ought, then, to be rendered, "And God said, Let there be luminaries in the expanse of heaven," &c. Verse 16. "And God, indeed, made the two great luminaries, the greater luminary for regulating the day, and the inferior luminary, with the stars, for regulatingthe night."

The term *great*, when applied to the moon, which the astronomers say is less than any of the stars, the Sceptic exultingly exclaims proves Moses to be in error. Not so fast, sir, if you please: for as respects the giving of light to our planet, of which the historian speaks, the moon is a *great* luminary—so great that she gives more light to our earth than all your countless millions of fixed stars and suns.

There are some passages which we cannot call *mistranslations*, because though that in the text may be so in fact, another translation being offered in the margin, the reader has his choice. But those who have not Bibles with the marginal renderings of the translators, have not this advantage—and, indeed, they cannot be said to have the King's version. An instance of this sort we have in Genesis iv. 7. "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door." In the margin it reads, "If thou doest well, shalt thou not have the excellency? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door." This is not only as well sustained by the original, but has this preference, that it seems to comport with the whole circumstances of the case: for as Cain seems to have been jealous that his younger brother was to gain an ascendency over him, to allay that jealousy it is intimated that if he did well he should not lose the excellency implied in his birthright.

Lamech the fifth in descent from Cain, and the first polygamist on record, in the common version is made to express himself very unintelligibly to his two wives. A change in the punctuation sets the matter in a more luminous attitude to the mind. Some fears for the personal safety of Lamech seems to have seized his wives, since his son Tubal-cain had invented the instruments of death, having been the instructer of every artificer in brass and iron. He exclaims in a sort of poetry, "Hearken to my voice, you wives of Lamech! listen attentively to my words: for have I slain a man, that I should be wounded: and a young man, that I should be hurt? For seven fold vengeance was to be taken for Cain; but for Lamech will be taken seventy times seven."

Mistranslation 3. Gen. iv. 13. "And Cain said to the Lord, My punishment is greater than I can bear." ver. 15. "And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him"—which should be translated, "And Cain said to the Lord, Is my crime too great to be forgiven? And the Lord gave *a sign* to Cain that whoever found him would not kill him." *Oth*, translated *mark*, is the word translated *sign*, Gen. ix. 13. The bow was appointed, *le oth*, for a

Digitized by Google

sign or *token* that the world should not be destroyed. So God gave *oth* (a *sign*, pledge, or token,) to Cain that he should not be killed.

To have put a *mark* upon his person would have been rather the signal for destruction than a pledge of defence. At this time, being the year of the world 130, the inhabitants could not have been less than 1200; and if they married about 20 in those days, there might have been 400,000.

It is not improbable that the 16th verse may also be a mistranslation; but of this we would not be positive as in the instances given. It is as probable, however, that it ought to have been translated, "And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, from the east of Eden, and dwelt a *vagabond* in the earth"—instead of "dwelling in the land of *Nod*;" for *nad* signifies a vagabond. And as we have no other allusion to "the land of *Nod*," it is not improbable but it is a common, rather than a proper noun, in this place.

EDITOR.

The Millennium---No. 6.

THE MAN OF SIN.

WE are now to speak of the destruction of *the Man of Sin* by the *brightness of Messiah's coming*. But first the question must be answered—clearly, fully, satisfactorily answered—*Who is the Man of Sin?* If this cannot be done with authority, it is all idle to talk of understanding the prophecies. If we understand not the principal figure in all the prophetic gallery, we may lay our hand upon our lips and disturb society no more with our reveries. But it can be done, it must be done, and it ought not to be considered presumption in us if we say we shall attempt it in the full persuasion that we can do it. I would here again crave the indulgence of all my readers, and all the literalists, especially of my worthy brother of Indiana, had they not stimulated me by the boldness and eloquence of their example to speak as one that had the authority of evidence insurmountable.

Who, then, is *the Man of Sin?* Without hesitation I say first he is *the little horn* of Daniel's fourth beast. The fourth beast of Daniel, great and terrible, with *iron teeth* and *ten horns*, most exactly and fitly represents the *Roman* empire. To the historian and the scripturean this is almost a self-evident proposition, and altogether the plainest proposition in symbolic prophecy. It is one in which all learned men, and great men, as we call them, have concurred. That Daniel's *fourth beast is a symbol of the Roman Empire in its glory*, is confessit by many Catholic Doctors themselves.

To tell my lay brother M'Corkle that all the Protestant literati, the learned and great men of christendom, are of this judgment, is, I know, no great commendation of it; for he, as well as some other of your brethren, Mr. Editor, think, or at least speak, as if they thought that one obscure layman, either on the Allegheny summit, or in the

Digitized by Google

valley of the Mississippi, is more likely to be right in any question of biblical criticism, than all the commentators and expositors of prophecy from Jerome to George Croly.

More than this, Mr. Editor: some of your friends think that the *novelty* of an opinion is a sort of letter patent for its favorable reception and good standing: for if any body thought the same thoughts, or spoke the same words only once since the man of sin was conceived, it is a very suspicious circumstance indeed. You, sir, are supposed to be the coiner of bran new ideas, and I learn that the greatest and most besetting sin of the Reformers is their admiration of original ideas and a deep sense of their own *originality* of thought and discovery, with a corresponding jealousy. Believe me, Mr. Editor, this is as dangerous as it is a vainglorious zeal. 'Why, sir,' said a layman the other day, (I mean, sir, one of your *unofficial* brethren,) in reply to his bishop, "The Methodists *do* that," and "The Presbyterians *think* this," as if it was an unequivocal mark of the beast to think or say any thing in common with a Methodist or a Presbyterian. I must, however, in justice say, that I am pleased to discover that this spirit has been quenched, to a great extent, within the last two years. The pride of originality is the first born of Satan, and it, like him, seduces its admirers into the most fatal errors.

But to return from this digression into which my brethren of the literal school have seduced me, I repeat that *the little horn with the eyes of a man and a mouth speaking great things*, and *the Man of Sin*, are identically the same ecclesiastical personages contemplated under different imagery. The *little horn* (first indeed but little) *politic* and *blasphemous*, was in the order of time the *eleventh* horn, and came up *behind* rather than *after* the ten—*unobserved and disregarded at first.* But it may be instructive and satisfactory to scan hastily the leading points of coincidence between Paul's *Man of Sin* and Daniel's *little horn.*

1. There was something hindered the revelation of the Man of Sin, as Paul explains 2 Thess. ii. and until that was taken out of the way he could not be displayed.

So before the little horn had power and room to grow, three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots.

2. The horn had a mouth that spoke very great things.

The Man of Sin opposes and exalts himself above all gods.

3. The horn had a look more stout than his fellows.

The Man of Sin sits in the temple of God, showing himself that he is a god, usurping and exercising divine power!

4. The horn made war against the saints and wore them out.

The Man of Sin is also the son of perdition; and while he exalts himself above all that is called a god, he also *opposes* God—"Saul, why persecutest thou *me*?"

5. The words *consume* and *destroy*, Daniel vii. 26. are applied to the little horn.

The same words are applied by Paul to the Man of Sin, 2 Thess. ii. 8.

Digitized by Google

Many other coincidences, as palpable as these will occur in the sequel.

The Man of Sin and the little horn are symbols of the same personage. But still this does not identify the thing of which these are only *images*. Before we presume to uncover the Man of Sin, we must again propose the question, *Who is the Man of Sin?* Again we answer, He is not merely the little horn, the eleventh horn of the fourth beast of Daniel; but he is the *healed head* of the wild beast described by John in his vision written in the 13th chapter of the Apocalypse. John's beast, like Daniel's fourth beast, combines the characteristic attributes of the three preceding beasts. The Assyrian lion, the Medo-Persian bear, and the Grecian leopard lend all their powers to the Roman monster, with his *seven heads* and *ten horns*. One of these, the *imperial* head, received a mortal wound in the person of Augustuslus; but, contrary to all expectation, the wound was *healed*, and the monster assumes a new attitude—a new character—a new name, with the same malignant spirit of the dragon, and identifies himself with the *eleventh horn* in the following striking points of similarity:—

"The little horn had a mouth," says Daniel; and says John, "there was given to him [the beast] a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies, and power was given to him to continue forty-two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God to blaspheme his name and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven (perhaps, the Apostles;) and it was given to him to make war with the saints and to overcome them; and power was given to him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations; and all that dwell upon the earth shall worship the beast, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

Having, then, identified Daniel's *little horn*, John's *beast* with a *healed head*, and Paul's *man of sin* and *son of perdition*, we have materials to draw out as large as life the Man of Sin, and to set him before our readers in all his hideous deformity.

But as still farther prefatory and preparative to this development, we must invite the attention of the curious reader to a survey of Daniel's *fourth beast*, behind whose ten horns this little horn with human eyes and mouth sprang up.

Be it then observed, that the most appropriate symbol of a *belligerent* kingdom, empire, or state, is a wild beast. In the Chaldaic Hebrew of Daniel we find the word *chaiyah*, which in the Greek version is translated *theerion*—in our tongue, not merely a beast, but a savage or *wild ferocious beast*. The kingdom of the Messiah never is, because it cannot be, symbolized by a beast. All belligerent states or nations are, then, savage or wild beasts in symbolic language—because this is their most appropriate image.

Now while in Daniel's vision a *lion* with eagle's wings pictured out the Chaldean empire in its glory—while a *bear* raised upon its hinder legs, having three ribs in its mouth between its teeth, pictured out the Medo-Persian —while a *leopard*, with four heads, and four wings upon

Digitized by Google

its back, symbolized the Grecian—a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly, with huge iron teeth, devouring, breaking in pieces, and stamping the residue of its prey under its feet, with ten horns upon its head, as aptly pictured forth the Roman empire in the strength, ferocity, and glory of its Pagan state; and about the time of its falling into ten kingdoms Daniel thus describes it 550 years before it came to its meridian glory in the person of Augustus Cesar. John, who lived and wrote more than 600 years after him, saw it still more distinctly rising out of the sea, having *seven heads*, and *ten horns*, and *ten crowns*, and names of blasphemy upon its heads—resembling most the leopard which preceded it, next the bear which preceded that, and next the lion, which, though most remote from it, was the origin and the occasion of its existence.

This savage beast combined the ferocious natures of the leopard, the bear, and the lion; but because of its malignity to a beautiful woman standing upon the moon, clothed with the sun, and adorned around her head with twelve stars, it was broken into ten pieces by the irruptions of the Goths, the Heruli, the Franks, the Huns, and the Vandals, with other fierce and warlike nations from the North and East. These fierce and ruthless invaders, like a resistless tempest, burst forth upon the Roman empire, then effeminate and unnerved by its luxury and licentiousness, and carried every thing before them. Desolation and blood marked every step of their progress; and having spread themselves over the whole empire, even to the gates of Byzantium on the east, and to the western ocean, they divided the inheritance amongst themselves.

These conquerors of the Roman empire were themselves conquered by it; and although at first exasperated by the unbelieving Romans to harass, plunder, and destroy the christians, contrary to the common course of conquerors, they embraced the religion of the conquered.

The ten kingdoms into which the empire, still called Roman, was now divided, have been variously classed; but all agree that ten distinct kingdoms have been formed out of it, and at one time they stood thus:—Machiavel and Bishop Lloyd thus enumerate the ten horns: 1. The kingdom of the Huns. 2. The Ostrogoths. 3. The Visigoths. 4. The Franks. 5. The Vandals. 6. Sueves and Alans. 7. The Burgundians. 8. The Heruli, Rugii, Scyrri, and other tribes, which composed the Italian kingdom of Odoacer. 9. The Saxons. 10. The kingdom of the Lombards.

Bishop Newton, in quoting Machiavel, says the Huns possessed themselves of Hungary; the Ostrogoths, of Mœsia; the Visigoths, of Pannonia; the Franks, of France; the Vandals, of parts of Africa; the Sueves and Alans, of Gascoigne and Spain: the Burgundians, of Burgundy; the Heruli and Turingi, of Italy; the Saxons and Angles, of Britain; the Lombards, first of the Danube, and afterwards of Italy.

Soon after these ten kingdoms were organized and became separate and independent powers, the *little horn*, unobserved at first, began to

Digitized by Google

grow, and never did it arrest much political attention till it absorbed the power of three *horns* which were gradually plucked up by the roots to make room for it. Three of the ten kingdoms—namely, those of the Heruli, the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards, were annexed to the dominions of the Pope, and thus he became invested with temporal power. It was then he assumed the *three keys* in his arms, and the *triple crown*, or mitre, as a temporal prince—then he made himself appear more stout than his fellows: for he soon learned to hurl his anathemas and excommunications at the princes who would not succumb to his dictation. Thus *Pagan* Rome became *Papal* Rome—the Mystery—the embryo, in Paul's time yet unborn, is now a full grown man, and justifies the portraits of Daniel, Paul, and John.

Having marked the prominent lines of the fourth *beast*, we are prepared to hear Paul describe the Man of Sin. 2 Thess. iii. 10.—

"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved."

Paul seems to have had in his mind, in this draft, the painting of Daniel; for he speaks of THE *Apostacy*—THAT *man of sin*—THAT *wicked* or *lawless one*, as a person or thing long ago marked out and described.

The article definite and emphatic in the original, is used by the Apostle throughout this description, and cannot fail to arrest the attention of those who value its import to this person as one well known. *Sin*, the well established name of idolatry, characterizes him. Though but one, he is many. As there was but one Pharaoh, one Ptolemy, one Cesar, one Louis, &c. at a time, although many Pharaohs, Ptolemies, Cesars, Louises, &c.—so, although there have already been almost *three hundred* Popes in the long succession of 1200 years, we have had but one man of idolatry—one Pope at a time.

The Apostacy promoted the Pope, and the Pope promoted the Apostacy—"He opposes and exalts himself *above all* that is called a god," whether civil magistrates or ecclesiastical rulers. He has destroyed by "crusades, inquisitions, massacres, and horrid executions," those sincere christians who preferred the word of God to his authority. He has deposed kings and emperors—advanced others as they regarded his interests. He has obliged princes to hold his stirrup, to kiss

Digitized by Google

his toe, to stand barefoot at his gate. He has put his foot upon the necks of kings, and with his own toe kicked off an imperial crown. He has suffered himself to be addressed by the title of "His Holiness," "Our Lord God the Pope," "Another God upon Earth," "King of Kings, and Lord of Lords." He wears upon his mitre, on some occasions, "*His Holiness Lord God the Pope.*"

"He sits in the temple of God."—The Pope is not *Antichrist.* He does not deny "the Father and the Son." He does not deny that "Christ has come in the flesh." He fills up none of the outlines of John's Antichrist: for he acknowledges that Christ has come in the flesh; he acknowledges both the Father and the Son; he sits *in the temple of God;* he confesses all the articles of the christian faith: but in the temple he sits as God; he claims to be the Vicar of Christ—to forgive sins. On the day of his inauguration the Lord's table is made his footstool. He stands upon the altar of God, as it is called, in Saint Peter's Church. "He changes times and laws," absolves and anathematizes with infallibility as God himself. "He opens his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven." He is emphatically "THE LAWLESS ONE."

But this man of idolatry is only the head of the Apostacy, as he was the offspring of it. That is a kingdom over which he presides, and is held in veneration by multitudes who regard him as *Father,* and yield to him their understanding, conscience, and affections. He is rather the rival, than the Vicar of Christ; and if the term *Antichrist* is applicable to him at all, it must be in a figurative acceptation: for Antichrist, as defined by John, applies much more to the infidel or Mahometan power, than to one who confesses every article of the christian faith.

It may be necessary, however, to lay together all those passages that speak of Antichrist, and to inquire whether they do apply to the man of idolatry. They are only *four,* and these are found in the two epistles of John:—"Little children, it is the last time; and as you have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now are there many Antichrists, by which we know that it is the last time. He is Antichrist that denies the Father and the Son. Every spirit that confesses not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God; and this is that spirit of Antichrist of which you have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world. For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an Antichrist."

The false teachers foretold by Christ to multiply in the last days of the Jewish state, are here spoken of in the plural as *Antichrists,* either as persons assuming to be in stead of Christ or against him. But there is a certain spirit which is described as the spirit of Antichrist, which may peradventure figuratively allude to the great defection from christianity in the East or in the Western Roman Empire. It does not, upon the whole premises, appear that we are authorized to apply it to the Man of Sin already described.

Digitized by Google

We have prosecuted the subject of the Man of Sin and the Apostacy as far as convenient at this time, and prepared the way for the examination of those Scriptures that speak of his consumption and destruction. This we must allot to another paper, that we may not be burdensome.

May we not, then, say that we have satisfactorily ascertained the Man of Sin to be identical with the Apocalyptical *beast* described by John, Rev. 12th and 13th chapters, and with the *little horn* that arose out of Daniel's *fourth beast*, described in his 8th chapter; —that the characters given these all harmonize and meet in the Pope of Rome and in the system of which he is the head. The judicious reader needs not to be informed, that having identified whom the Lord is to consume by the spirit of his mouth and utterly destroy by the brightness of his coming, we have now only to learn by what means he is to be *destroyed*, to understand what is meant by "the *brightness of the coming* of the Lord." The reader that perceives the important bearing which these inquirers have upon the whole subject of prophecy, will doubtless excuse the tediousness of this disquisition.

REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

UNION.

Virginia, December 26, 1834.

BROTHER CAMPBELL,

Sir—YOU are aware that fortune has placed some persons within the precincts of auspicious circumstances, from the favorable advantages of which, others of an humbler station in life are unhappily debarred, and for life. Among the latter I have the misfortune to find myself located, and there to remain, I fear, so long as I remain on the globe. But nevertheless, I would not have you to understand from this, that I am at all disposed to repine at the condition in the limits of which a kind over-ruling Providence has, in wisdom, seen proper to place me. No, sir—under my present convictions of right and wrong, of virtue and vice, I never will bow submissively at the foot of Madam Pride, and sacrifice a good conscience at the shrine of ambitious fortune. But yet I lack some things that are inseparably connected with my intellectual happiness, which competency could have placed within my immediate reach, if she herself had been subservient to my will. Had she granted me these little indispensables, I think I should have possessed a fortune equal to that of Crœsus in value, but not of the same kind. From the resources of such a fortune I could have drawn largely of intellectual riches, wealth which is as lasting as life itself, and which when hoarded in the greatest abundance, instead of loading the mind with worldly care and unnecessary anxiety, kindly dissipates all care, and leads the mind to the wholesome contemplations of virtue, her supreme fountain and exceedingly great reward, which shall be awarded to all her sincere votaries.

Digitized by Google

The following ingredients when compacted, make the only fortune which I conscientiously and honestly crave. 1. A large library of well selected books. 2. A liberal education. And 3dly. A sufficiency of time, in which to read, reflect upon, and mature that which I should read, if so favored. If I esteem any thing as being superlative in worth, it is a liberal education. In the spirit of all truth and candor, I say it, it grieves me to hear learned persons, who have, under the favorable auspices of a good patrimonial fortune, starched their collars within the learned walls of some literary Alma Mater—advance learned notions which are totally beyond the utmost ken of my little capital of homespun education.

Having in this, the caption of my preachment, informed you that the foregoing are so many real difficulties in my way of mental progression, I will in the conclusion submit a few of them to you, which you may dispose of as your better judgment may dictate. In order to do this, permit me, if you please, to ride in your convenient vehicle, this one time, if never again; and during the excursion we will talk all over. Taking as granted that you have no particular objection, I will ascend and here open the conversation, reserving to myself the privilege of making one speech before you answer a single word, and then having heard the whole you may rejoin. The evening not being very wholesome, I will, in my statement of difficulties, endeavor to be as simple and laconic as possible. In the first place, what do the Regular Baptists mean, if they have any ideas equal to the words which they utter, when they speak of evangelical Quakers, Lutherans, *et cetera?* Now, sir, you see my difficulty No. 1, in its native colors. If the solution of this question could secure to me a living of £27,000 per annum, I should forever remain as poor as I am at present—because I can form no conception of two evangelical beings who differ as widely as do the Baptists and Quakers. An evangelical Quaker and an evangelical Baptist, when put up in the same package, I presume would almost constitute as perfect a paradox as ever was exhibited to human optics. The former denies in word and action two possitive institutions of him who taught as one having authority—viz. Christian immersion and the Lord's supper. These they look upon as mere externals—mere non-essentials. As though they supposed that man could perform any act which might with propriety be called his own act, unless it be the legitimate offspring of his mind co-operating with the physical functions by which such act is performed. The mind is, and ever will be, the grand lever which gives motion to matter, immediately or remotely; and I think that no man is accountable for an action to the accomplishment of which his mind does not move him, and *vice versa*, no one may expect to receive a reward for a course of conduct to which his mind does not impell him, and in which it has no part to perform. Thus I reason; and those who reason differently must have studied morals in some other school than the one at Antioch or Jerusalem! And to say that any institution which Messiah has imposed upon us is a mere non-essential, is directly and emphatically offering violence to the

Digitized by Google

whole system of morals laid down by him. Because, if useless, why did he institute them? He instituted no act which does not in some way or other tend to the complete salvation of the man who renders a hearty obedience to the same. These institutes the Quaker rejects for the aforesaid unreasonable reasons; while to the due observance of which the Baptist adheres with a tenacity almost without a parallel in history, philosophy, or morals? How, then, in the nature of science and common sense, can these diametrical antipodes be equally and truly evangelical. To say they are, is but to offer the most horrid insult to the just and prudent laws of language, and commit gross outrage upon the common sense of good plain common sense people, who never have it in their power to dive into the deep *arcana* of learned mystery and confusion. I would ask for information, what is the meaning of the word *evangelical?*—this word which seems, and only seems, to unite two parties who are as far apart as the two ends of a semi-circle. Buck lays within twenty inches of my nose, but I will not consult him about it, nor will I even brush the dust from his sheep-skin covering, until I have other uses for him than that under consideration; because I think, on this subject, he would, in all probability, be too hide-bound to depose favorably. The term is a sort of Latino-Greek, somewhat anglicized—Euangelikos is pure Greek; and means when translated into English, pertaining to, or like the proclamation of good news; or, as Paul says, in Romans vi. 17. "Ye have obeyed that type, or mould of doctrine, into which ye were cast." Whatever is cast into a mould receives the full impression of the mould, or else it is an unfinished piece of casting, to say the most of it, and consequently cannot be denominated mould-like or type-like. The disciples at Rome were cast into the gospel mould—touched all its parts; yes, and the impression Paul says was from the heart. But this same mould is still used for moulding disciples who do not touch immersion and the Lord's supper; and still we are to be told that such persons are evangelical nevertheless. Will you inform me by what process of reasoning this is established? As for myself, I profess not to know, nor do I envy the man who has literary or theological sagacity enough to come to such absurd conclusions. But what has become of that rare quality in human nature, which we sometimes call consistency? Can it be found in the charitable adjective which we have been descanting upon? No, sir, I presume it would puzzle a philosopher to find the faintest glimmerings of that precious commodity, in all that bright array of liberality and charity, as set forth in expressions of such close connexion, seeming similarity of christian conduct, and reciprocated brotherly affection; there it is not to be found; and here is the proof. If these Regular Baptists consider Quakers, Methodists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, &c. evangelical christians, in the true import of said terms, would they not take delight in communing with them, on every suitable occasion; but do they ever do so? I answer, they never have, as far as my knowledge informs me; but on the contrary debar them from the Lord's table whom they acknowledge to be evangelical. Such expressions, then, I would call misnomers—

Digitized by Google

names for nothing—signs without appropriate ideas—which pass current only among those who would be thought charitable, who use them, and when stript of seeming charity, are worth just nothing at all.

I would not have you to understand that I introduced these good men, the Baptist and the Quaker, and placed them in attitudes so contradistinguishing as the foregoing development shows, for the sake of casting contempt upon either party. No, sir; my motto always was, is now, and I hope ever will be, "*Principles—not men.*" These are they against which I wage interminable war. I named them because there is between them such a marked difference in evangelical faith and action—and still are said to be, it may be by mutual consent, evangelical. Here I will doff my hat and bid farewell to those brethren, and proceed to my next difficulty.

My next difficulty is this: If Paidobaptists (who are for the most part Paidorantists) while they seem to exercise so much good feeling towards the Baptists, really and sincerely desire fellowship with the Baptists, why do they not lay aside their notions about infant membership in the church, and the practice of sprinkling them, and the old adults, in order to indoctrinate them thereunto, and come and join in one consolidated phalanx with the Baptists, be one body, have one and the same spirit, possess the same mind that was in Christ Jesus, and fight the one common enemy of man, and let one another rest from hard-hearted, acrimonious bickering, for a little season? I think that if they really desired such fellowship as much as simple words go to show, they could obtain, and would obtain it, without any sacrifice on their part, for they and the Baptists both perfectly well agree that immersion is a valid, scriptural baptism, while both the Baptist denomination and the Bible give neither countenance nor sanction to the practice of infant or adult sprinkling, (or rantism,) now in vogue among Paidobaptists. If they desire a union, it is on their own peculiar principles and practices. They wish to yield not one point which now distinguishes them from the Baptists. Notwithstanding we hear so much from them about union of effort, in missionary, tract, Sunday school, and Bible societies, what good has such a union done? Just so much, and but little more, it keeps afloat a continual current of suspicion—see the tracts that emanate from these fountains, and likewise the Sunday school books—they all have to pass through the voting process, and very often they vote, and vote, and vote, till they (the standard publication committee of some 9 or 10) vote every thing out of the books or tracts that was worth reading, or good to be treasured up in the mind. The majority rules in deciding what the timid school scholar shall read, wrong or right. But to keep the appearance of charity, they agree to submit to such rules—all but the Methodists, and they, like Jeshurun, discovered that they were growing fat and strong, and therefore they kicked, sacked the firm, and set up business for themselves; and this I think was perfectly right. This proves to me that no union, other than that which is based upon the teachings of the New Testament, is, or can

Digitized by Google

be, substantial and lasting, many able minds deposing in the opposite scale notwithstanding. If all christendom would, on the first day of February, 1835, unite on the plain basis of New Testament principles, there is no divine (I mean clergyman) nor Prophet that I have any knowledge of, who could foretell a tenth part of the glorious effects which such a mighty change would produce. But such is the pride and inglorious ambition of self-willed humanity, that we may not expect such things for many years to come, unless, perchance, they be shaken to pieces by some terrible moral earthquake. All the sects are, in many important particulars, entirely dissimilar in doctrine and practice: and the great aim of each party seems to be this, to try, by all charitable and prudent means, to convert the others to himself, and conceive that when the millennial morn shall dawn upon our world, and the apostate church as well as the world shall be converted in a day, all shall be of his party and shall be a mammoth church *in toto orbe*. The most charitable or liberal lecture that I ever heard had a slight squinting this way. The preacher was talking from the words, "And all with one consent began to make excuse." He observed that "some people objected to religion because there were some, many conflicting opinions entertained by those who professed it." "It is," said he, "a mistake: there is not as great a difference among the people of God as you suppose. The various denominations of which the church is composed are just like the *radii* of the sun: they are somewhat scattered and apart; but still they are all converging to the great Sun of Righteousness, and the nearer they get to him the more easily they blend, until they meet in one grand focus." Another--"They are like the army of our late war: they all come from different places, indulged, in some small degree, while at home, in party spirit, indulged in prejudice, &c.; but when the alarm was given all minor differences were forgotten, and they rushed to the Atlantic shores to defend our rights, property, and liberty; in doing which each fought in his particular company, under his own officers; some on land and some on the water: but notwithstanding, there were many companies thus congregated, they had met there with only one grand design, and that was to repell the common enemy. In this they had but one heart and one mind; and one, and only one national star-spangled banner, high lifted in air, waved proudly over the whole army. And just so it is in the church. We have many little flags by which we distinguish our little companies; but, after all, there is but one great banner that waves over all, and that is the banner of Righteousness." But before the gentleman had got through with his subject he began to browbeat the Universalists. *Hoida!* said I to myself, what a sudden change! Just a little while ago all the sects were the radii, converging; and now turned to the radii diverging, or running in parallel lines, in either of which directions there will be neither a focus nor a blending. Said I, what a bad thing it is to have a bad memory!

Instead of fighting under the large banner as they did formerly, the common enemy, this man has made war with one of the national com-

Digitized by Google

panies; it is a pity, thought I, for men to fight so eagerly after talking so friendly, and making such kind and lovely confessions of friendskip! I have one more subject on which I wish to ask you a few questions, and then I will have done for the evening; and if you charge me nothing for my passage this time, you shall hear from me again in some two or three moons from the present time.

There are two Baptist churches situated in the same neighborhood, not more than 300 miles from Cape Henry, and about the same distance from your village, but not in a direct line between the two, but considerably north of such a line; the churches, if I am not misinformed, once were but one body, which from some circumstance or other divided itself into two congregations; and for several years past many in each congregation have been willing to lay aside and forget old difficulties, and come together again; and I feel happy in saying there are but few in either church who oppose the measure; and these promise to yield to the decision of the majority. But, at a meeting held not long since for the purpose of considering this matter, a ministering brother got up and spoke to the following effect;—"I think the church had better wait a little longer; it is better that you should put it off some five or six months, than to run into the business rashly and inconsiderately. You require much time yet in which to prepare your minds." Now, sir, this thing has been talked about for years, and still the church is asked to wait six months longer in order to reconcile christians to each other; both of which churches hold the same doctrines. I wish to ask you to solve this question or the former, for I have not learning enough. If the completion of this object has already occupied five years without effect, and shall still require 5 or 6 months to embody the two in one congregation of already reconciled disciples, how much time ought that united body to require in converting or reconciling as many sinners to the humbling doctrines of the cross, of which they are ashamed, and which they are perfect strangers? Answer the questions herein propounded. Receive my wishes for yourself, and believe me to be your sincere friend and brother until death.

A LOVER OF UNION.

Education---No. 2.

MY text for this prefatory address on the subject of Education, will be found in the 162d page of the *Cross & Baptist Journal:*—

"ROMAN CATHOLICS IN THE VALLEY.

We have three or four more articles yet to publish under the heads of "Foreign Conspiracy," &c. They are suspended for a week or two. We insert, from the Christian Watchman, an extract from a letter to the editor from a gentleman in Illinois, and leave the statements with our readers as matter of reflection.

Digitized by Google

"I will say to you, that all which can now be done by all christendom, would not save the Valley from having a majority of Catholics in ten years You can have no idea of the floods of Germans, principally from Austria, that are pouring into the Valley, all Catholics. In St. Louis alone, the large church is filled every Sunday, at 10 o'clock, with a German audience, who hear mass, and have afterwards a sermon in German. All these emigrants came the present year. They are nothing to the numbers that have gone into the country. Every steam boat brings more or less. Accounts that may be relied on, say, that large bodies are coming next year from Austria, the Catholic cantons of Switzerland, and the different states of Germany. Congress, you know, has granted a township of land to a body of Poles. Their agents are here finding a place to locate their grant.—That township will be a rallying point for that people; and the agents state that many thousands of their countrymen now scattered over Europe, and thousands now in Poland, intend coming to this land of liberty, during the next five years.—They are all *staunch Catholics*. *Ireland* has just began in earnest to come out of her hive. Many thousands of her Catholic children may be expected *now*, every year. Catholic countries will now send us thousands where they formerly sent one. The reason is plain. Catholic emigrants tell me that multitudes are coming now, that would rather have starved than come many years ago. We have now priests, and Catholic churches, so that our children "will not become heathen," or in other words, *Protestant*. This is the reason given by them, and is undoubtedly the true one. I have no doubt but the emigration from Ireland alone, for the next five years, will yearly average fifty thousand to the Valley. Every one acquainted with the subject rates it much higher than one hundred thousand. But Germany, Switzerland, and Poland, are emigrating by *wholesale*. In a very short time, all these can *vote*, and the Catholic influence is *now* felt here, powerfully, and will shortly be *decisive*. Emigration, alone, in ten years, will give the Catholics a complete ascendency. But every other thing works in their favor. Their schools in the Valley are numerous, even now, and educate eur richest and most influential citizens' children of the Protestant class. These schools are filled to overflowing. Among non-professing Protestants, the Catholics are popular, and thousands consider them the only bulwark against a union of church and state, which they think the eastern christians are laboring to bring about. The violent publications in our religious papers aid the Catholics much. They are silent and appear to the world's people to be most cruelly persecuted. How imprudent are many pieces that appear! "No Catholic ought to hold any office in the United States, for none can be believed on their oath." This, and the like, do immense injury.—Non-professors, who are Protestants by name, can see no difference between a Catholic and Protestant; both are equally good neighbours and citizens, and such tirades are put down as persecution —The Catholics of American birth, scattered over the West, are very good citizens, and it is bad policy to rail against the Catholics

Digitized by Google

en masse. Depend upon it, the course that has been pursued in this respect has been very detrimental to Protestantism. Not all the wealth of the "Propaganda," its priests and Jesuits, could have done as much for their cause in the West, in ten years, as the "burning of the convent" in Charlestown. Popular feeling is much excited here, on this subject."

Some years since, when I expressed, on sundry occasions, my convictions that in less than half a century the Catholic religion would be established in these United States by law; I was stared at and laughed at as one that dreamed. It is true I appended to my *prediction*, as some ironically called it, this *proviso*—unless the ancient gospel prevailed over all sectarian gospels, or the apocalyptic angel poured his vial upon the seat of the beast. But now we are solemnly told that the Catholics are pouring, like a torrent from the mountain, into the Valley of the Mississippi; and that all the Christian powers cannot now prevent the predominance of the Papal religion in all this immense Valley, which is at no distant day to control the destinies of this great nation. Had it not been for Martin Luther, Paschal wisely observes, Peter Loyola, the founder of the Jesuits, would have governed the world; and now it appears again, that unless the gospel preached on Pentecost triumphs, Peter Loyola will yet govern the world in despite of Martin Luther.

But what is to be done; or what would those panic-stricken sectarians, that fear this mammoth sect, have to be done in this crisis? Our infidel government, as some of them call it, would as soon have a Catholic chaplain as a Presbyterian; and here we have no state religion. But, say they, let us once have a Catholic majority at the poles, and that majority is omnipotent, under our constitution, to alter and amend, and new modify it at pleasure. A Catholic majority, say they, and all our liberties are gone—forever gone. And, indeed, the man that could doubt such an event on such a hypothesis, must be equally ignorant of ecclesiastic history and of human nature.

What, then, can be done? The die, it seems, is already cast. No earthly power can stay the progress of the Jesuits in America. Yes, says one, let our government prevent their migration hitherward any more—then down goes our temple of equal rights and our boasted indifference to all political concern in religion. We cannot place Catholics under disabilities. If they swear allegiance to our heretical government, though they have the Pope in their heart as large as life, still they must be citizens, and eligible to all honor and political office. Nothing can be done politically except to declare that the national dominion is ours and our children's forever, and that we will not sell an acre of it to any foreigner. And are we prepared for this?

Why, then, raise such a cry against the Papists? Why arouse their jealousy? Why tell them that we fear them—that we hate them, and that we expect them to arise and slaughter us, or *blow up* our Congress, and ruin our national institutions? Is not this bad policy—is

Digitized by Google

it not cowardly—is it not inhumane—is it not anti-American? Will the alarmists tell us what they mean? What would they wish the nation to do? Why create a panic which they cannot allay? And why afflict ourselves by the anticipations of evils which will only fall upon our children when we have not the power to prevent them? That our liberties are to be sacrificed, and our children too, at the shrine of Peter's successor, is no doubt a grievous reflection.

I would not say that we ought not wisely to look forward, and, if we can, prevent the ills which we fear. It is our duty to be up and doing. But in the present case it is, it seems, too late. The die is cast, and we as a nation are undone!!

I confess that there is much reason for alarm, and to doubt the long continuance of privileges of which it appears we are unworthy. The Roman hierarchy and Negro slavery, or the former by means of the latter, may, and in all probability will, dash the American ship upon a rock, and engulf us all in one common ruin.

But there is an ark of safety which might be reared, if we had one hundred and twenty years to construct it. That ark is UNIVERSAL EDUCATION—education patronized, sustained, guarded, and controlled by the State. Enlighten all, Catholic and Protestant.

Let it be the first care of every state to have all its children well educated. Let there be state funds, state teachers, state schools, and state laws compelling all to be enlightened. Let no uneducated youth, whether 21 or 22 years old, be considered his own master unless he be well educated in all the branches of a good English education. Is it not better to spend hundreds of thousands in educating the children of all the states, than millions in building jails, pillories, penitentiaries, ships of the line, garrisons, and in raising and sustaining standing armies?

An enlightened community cannot be enslaved—an ignorant and uneducated society cannot be free. And let me say, with all emphasis, to those who fear, and justly fear a Catholic ascendency, Remember that the Catholic bloodhounds of the dark ages were persons who never had read the Bible, who were hissed on Dissenters by the Priests, who have always feared light from that book, as Satan loves darkness.

Give the people the Bible without creeds. If the Governors were all atheists, as a political defence against Papal tyranny let them decree that the Bible shall be read by the same authority which sanctioned them in suspending legal process and courts of justice on Sundays. Let the Bible, as a school-book, be taught and read from the same policy, and by the same authority, which administers oaths before civil tribunals. In one word, let no squeamishness on the subject of a state religion, prevent the reading and teaching of the Bible: creeds and parties may be permitted to find their own quietus, but the Bible is the shield of the nation; and if it be not read and universally taught from Dan even to Beersheba, the Catholics will take away our place and nation just as certain as the waters of the Ohio descend into the Mississippi; provided only, that the original gospel be not generally proclaimed and received, and the Son of God come not to destroy the Man of Sin within half a century or less.

Digitized by Google

If any Jacobin Republican of the French school of 1789, ask me by what authority constitutional the United States' legislature, or that of any state, could establish the Bible as a school book in the hands of state teachers; I answer that the authority will be found in those sections which authorise oaths to be administered in courts of justice, or public officers to be introduced by the solemnities of the sacrament of an oath, and which ordains that courts shall not sit, and that all legal process shall be suspended on the day of Christ's resurrection.

Let my juvenile readers read this article to their parents and guardians; and if they ask why I should have introduced this article here, let them be informed that the obliquity of the times is the sole occasion of it. EDITOR.

The Rev. R. W. Landis, of Delaware, on Acts xxii. 16.

THIS gentlemen, conscious, I presume, that all his predecessors have failed to show that men are as good christians before they are immersed into Christ, or before Christ's name is put upon them by authority from Heaven, as afterwards—has taken up his pen and volunteered his services in the "*Christian Gazette*" of Philadelphia. A roll of these Gazettes. of more than four months old, was very politely forwarded to me by the reverend author of these "*debates*," accompanied with an apologetic note for their long delay in reaching Bethany. He will please accept my thanks for this unusual courtesy.

Being this winter engaged in preparing a new book for the press, extra my other labors, I could not in all good conscience read all this gentleman's stale criticisms in favor of his own Calvinism; especially as from a hasty glance it appears I had read them all, or nearly all, in the "*Debates on Campbellism*" of the late Obadiah Jennings, on which he seems to draw with the utmost freedom; yet in the reciprocities of refined courtesy I felt as though I ought to read one number at least with all care and candor. I did so; and accordingly perused the last forwarded me, under date of the 19th December. This contains his exegesis of Acts xxii. 16., in opposition to what he calls my exegesis or exposition of it. I confess the impression made on the perusal of this number is not favorable either to the intellect or heart of the author. I am sorry, truly sorry to have such a display of vanity and weakness, and something like disingenuousness on the part of my friend who *debates* with himself. Had he not pretended to be a *linguist*, at least to quote and apply the original Greek in this essay, I could have found an excuse for him. But the cant of criticism, like the cant of hypocrisy, is to me most nauseating. That I may, however, do him and my readers ample justice, we shall introduce him to their acquaintance by laying before them that part of the

Digitized by Google

article of December 19th, which I have read and examined, and on which I ground the above remarks:—

"But besides this, we have a plain and conclusive proof that *amartias sou*, "*thy sins*," cannot possibly refer to the sins of his whole life. Now we are told that sin *being washed away*, and *being forgiven*, are synonymous; because, when sin is washed away, it is forgiven, and when forgiven, it is washed away. A Campbellite author says, "Paul's sins *were not forgiven*, or *washed away*, until he was baptized;" plainly admitting that one of these things implies the other. Now compare these statements with the exposition which they give of the passage under consideration, and see what manifest absurdities they rush into. The original reads, *apolousai tas amartias sou*. So that *apolousai*, "wash away," is in the *imperative* mood; and the original, word for word, reads as follows: "*Do thou thyself wash away thy sins.*" Of course, then, as *washing away sins*, and *forgiving sins*, are, (if we rightly understand our opponents,) synonymous phrases, the idea contained in the passage, according to the Campbellite exposition, is, "*Be baptized, and forgive thyself thy sins*," So that if Paul's sins were forgiven in baptism, he, according to this system, forgave them himself If his sins against God, with all the sins of his life were washed away, he himself washed them away, according to this exposition. This beats the Roman Catholics all hollow: they only pretend to forgive one another; but this makes a man forgive himself, which is a great deal easier, much less expensive, and not half so disagreeable to the feelings. And thus the Campbellites plunge headlong into these revolting absurdities, in order to maintain that Paul's sins were not forgiven until he was baptized.

"But allowing that "*sins*" here refers to all the sins of his life; an important question arises: *How did Paul wash away his sins?* He was commanded to do it; and we are told he obeyed the command. Now, how did he do it? Campbellites tell us that "*it was done by the waters of baptism.*" But how, I ask, did he wash away his sins by the waters of baptism? This phrase is utterly unintelligible! Did he baptize himself? This, surely, will never be pretended: and yet if his sins were washed away by baptism, this is the only way in which it could, with propriety, be said that "he washed away his sins." But this is so absurd, that they will not admit it; especially as it contradicts the 18th verse of ch. ix., which says "*he* WAS *baptized;*" and the passage under consideration also says, "arise and BE *baptized;*" both in the passive voice. How then did Paul wash away his sins with the baptismal waters, if he did not baptize himself? It will not do to say that "his sins *were* washed away *in* baptism:" For *being washed*, and *washing one's self*, are entirely different things; and Paul is commanded *to wash away his own sins;* this, of course, differs from merely having them washed away. *How then did Paul wash away his sins?* Will some Campbellite let us know without contradicting himself or his system?

"The fact is, the exegesis which Campbell gives of this passage, can never be maintained; for it is self-contradictory, and fraught

Digitized by Google

with absurdity. The only exposition which can, with consistency, be maintained throughout, is the one which I have given above: viz. Paul was, before his baptism, a sincere Christian; and the washing away of sins, spoken of in the text, refers to cleansing himself from the stains which he had contracted by persecuting the church of Christ: and this, as before remarked, could only be done "*by calling upon the name of the Lord.*"

The only use that I have ever made of this passage in my defence of *the gospel according to Peter*, was to corroborate Acts ii. 37.—to show that remission of sins, *in some sense*, is connected with baptism, not only in conformity to the letter, but in conformity to all antiquity, and to the creeds of the reformed churches. To wash away sins by water alone is no doctrine of mine—never was. But that remission of sins through faith in the blood of Jesus, is connected with baptism in some sense; so that no man can *enjoy* the satisfaction of a *formal* and *sensible* remission of sins, but in conforming to the commandment of Peter I have asserted ever since I became an Editor. This gentleman, while he would feign appear *learned* and *orthodox* in opposing our views, and while he dishonors himself in seeking to dishonor me, has to concede that Paul did, in some sense, *wash away* at least *a part of his sins*, either against God or Christ, or man, in the act of immersion, or while *calling upon the Lord* at this time: for while Ananias was talking to Saul, his sins were not yet washed away in that sense in which they were after his immersion.

But I have given his criticism and his argument to the reader in the above extract. And what is it——what is its *point?* 'Tis this: That Paul forgave himself on the hypothesis he puts into my mouth. Because in the Greek Testament he is commanded *apolousai*, to wash away his sins, which being equivalent to forgive his own sins, implies his own agency in the affair of personal remission. This is the point. And to cut off my retreat he adds it will not do (that is for me) to say, that "his sins *were* washed away *in* baptism; for being washed, and washing one's self, are entirely different things." Now Paul is commanded to wash away his own sins (actively,) but he is commanded to arise and BE *baptized*—in the PASSIVE voice. This I say is the point, and the logic of the point. Now, gentle reader, let me affirm in the face of all this splendid display of genius, that it is based upon a *falsehood:* for take notice, I affirm in the face of all the critics in Europe and America, that there is not a *passive* verb, nor passive voice in Acts xxii. 16.!! and if *apolousai* signifies wash away your sins, *baptisai* signifies baptize yourself; for it is most true that *baptisai* and *apolousai* are both found in this verse in the same *mood, tense, number, person*, and VOICE! His castle is, then, built upon the *air!* In whatever sense, *according to the Greek*, Paul baptized himself, in the same sense he washed away his sins: for Ananias, *full of the Holy Spirit*, commanded him to do both (if there are two things to be done!!) in the same *voice, mood, tense, number*, and *person!!!*

Is there no man of learning and good sense in America to defend the orthodox traditions, or to oppose the apostolic! I am tired and

Digitized by Google

grieved, and vexed, with these smatterers and would-be critics. Must I be doomed to examine *ten* bushels of chaff for one grain of wheat, and to follow these prosing Doctors through all the sinuosity of their own stupidity. No man ought to expect it.

But I will let the reader see another of this reverend gentleman's literary triumphs:—

"In support of the above rendering, we can adduce the authority of Mr. Alex. Campbell himself; which, all must admit, is, in this case, *completely decisive.* On p. 164, vol. vii. of his *"Christian Baptist,"* he thus speaks: "Have you, my dear brother, ever adverted to the import of the participle in the commission, Matt xxviii. Disciple, or convert the nations, *immersing* them. I need not tell you that this is the exact translation. Let me ask you, then, does not the *active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, express the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed?* Cleanse the room, *washing* it; clean the floor, *sweeping* it; cultivate the field, *ploughing* it; sustain the hungry, *feeding* them; furnish the soldiers, *arming* them; convert the nations, *baptizing* them; *are exactly the same forms of speech. No person I presume will controvert this.*" Very good, very good, indeed, Mr. Campbell! We hope your reverence will not presume to controvert it after such a declaration. Now let us try the clause under discussion by this famous rule of Mr. C. and, in order to do him perfect justice, we will take his own translation. *"Wash away thy sins, invoking his name."* Here then is *the "active participle,"* [*"invoking,"*] connected with the *"imperative mood,"* [*"wash away."*] Of course, then, as *"The active participle, when connected with the imperative mood,* ALWAYS *expresses the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed,"* Paul was to wash away his sins by invoking the name of the Lord; and not by baptism. Thus we again have Mr. C. *versus* the Campbellites, and *versus* himself.

Now if we should even allow that *all Paul's sins* were washed away at this time, as the Campbellites pretend, it would follow that they were not, as they assert, washed away by baptism, but by *"calling upon the name of the Lord."*

Now the stroke of sophistry in this critical triumph consists in placing the active participle not with its own imperative, or the *principal* imperative; but with the *expletive*, or explanatory imperative· for according to my rule, as the gentleman calls it, (and I am not ashamed of it in the presence of all truly learned men,) it would read thus: 'Why do you tarry? Arise, and be immersed (and wash away thy sins) invoking the name of the Lord.' The washing away of sins is the *motive* to the *first* imperative in the sentence. And as Paul had persecuted those who had *invoked* that name, Ananias would have him immersed invoking it. Where now is the wit, and point, and candor of Mr. Landis!!

In this same piece Mr. Landis *proves* Saul to have been a *christian* before he was immersed, because Ananias the Jew called him *brother* Saul. The same logic will prove that all the Pentecostian congregations were good christians before Peter began to speak; for he

Digitized by Google

called them all *brethren* when he first opened his mouth!! It is tiresome to follow these folks through all their tricks of logic and literary triumphs.

Now if the Rev. Mr. Landis, of Delaware, will candidly, like a gentleman, acknowledge his errors on Acts xxii. 16. and will have Mr. Cushman to publish this piece in his Gazette, I will ask no other *price* for explaining to him why we have *baptisai* and *apolusai* both in the *middle voice* in Acts xxii. 16. A matter which I am very confident he does not understand; and I feel as confident that Mr. Cushman cannot explain it to him, nor even his predecessor Mr. Brantly. All of which is very respectfully submitted by

THE EDITOR.

A VOICE FULL OF BLASPHEMY FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Mr. Editor: What is the meaning of the word blasphemy—Revelation ii. 9; "I know the blasphemy of them who say they are Jews and are not, but do lie"?

Answer. When any person assumes a good name, and acts unworthy of it, in the Hebrew sense of the word he blasphemes. So Paul and John use the word. The name of God was blasphemed by the Jews among the Gentiles;—and here again, those who called themselves the Israel of God, Jews, and dishonored that title, are guilty of blasphemy against that good name.

There is also blasphemy against men, as well as against God, and Christ, and Israel. They who misrepresent and slander their brethren, are guilty of this blasphemy. I presume there is no one who ever read the Christian Baptist, or one volume of this periodical, who will not concur with me, in placing the following extract from the New Hampshire Morning Star, under the head of this species of BLASPHEMY.

ON JOHN III. 5.

"A third and last opinion of some others which I shall now notice is that it means '*water regeneration.*' This is the theory of Campbell whose destructive doctrine has been for some few years spreading in some parts of the western States, and wherever it has taken effect all the principles of the doctrine of salvation as introduced by the Saviour have withered like a blasted rose, and decayed like the plants of summer when chilled by the frosts of autumn. And what is his theory? Why, that water baptism is the new birth. But must not the sinner repent and pray God to pardon his sins? No, he answers; repent in scripture should be rendered reform; reform and be baptized and then salvation is sure. And if he is asked how long time is necessary for the sinner to reform and mend his ways, he answers it can be done in five minutes; and as well in that time as in five weeks

Digitized by Google

So a person may form a resolution to reform while standing at the water, and five minutes after be baptized, and he comes out of the water a saint and an heir of glory. And lest those who become proselytes to this system should enquire if they shall experience an inward change, and feel that they become new creatures, the advocates of Campbellism are careful to assure them, that those rapturous feelings that others describe, are only phantoms of the brain, and a vain imagination. They must believe that their sins are washed away by baptism, and be satisfied. Campbell bases his doctrine, as he thinks, on the Scriptures; but the foundation is only on a few detached passages: so that it is believed, that it will finally totter and fall; and if not before, it must when the winds of heaven blow, the storms beat, and God appears in flaming fire. One passage to prove water regeneration, besides the one at the head of this article, is Acts xxii. 16. "And now, why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." And what does this prove? Paul, in being baptized, was only to take upon him the profession of the Christian faith. Any one who reads may understand, and that clearly, that Paul prayed before he was baptized,—for God said to Annanias, "behold, he prayeth:" and that he was converted before being baptized is manifest, for Ananias said, "that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost:" and who can doubt that when he received his natural sight, his soul was filled with joy unspeakable. He then arose and was baptized. The language of Peter on the day of Pentecost, is also quoted to prove Campbellism: "Repeut and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Some translators render this, "Repent every one of you for the remission of sins, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ." However this may be, the whole system of Campbell is overthrown by the tenth chapter of Acts, where we have an account of the admission of the Gentiles into the church. And how was it? Cornelius and his household had their sins remitted, and then were baptized. Much other proof of forgiveness of sins before immersion might be cited, but we leave this subject now, praying that God may save men from such a flimsy net of Satan as this, where the enjoyment of religion in the heart, and the influences of the Spirit are ridiculed, and water baptism made the new birth."

CONVERSATIONS IN FATHER GOODAL's FAMILY CIRCLE, AT 'SQUIRE BAXTER's.

[*Continued from page* 598, *volume* 5.]

AFTER dinner Mr. *Payne* proposed the renewal of the discussion introduced at Mr. *Reed's*, touching the meaning of Peter's confession of faith in Jesus—"Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living God." Matt. xv.

Digitized by Google

Father Goodal. If this subject be introduced, I trust it will be for practical purposes; for whatever conduees not to piety or morality in religion, is idle, speculative, or vain jangling.

Mr. Payne. But you would have us understand what religion is, before you would have us begin the practice of it, Mr. Goodal.

Father Goodal. Certainly—I would have persons believe what God has testified concerning himself, and understand the communications of his Good Spirit, before they would profess to be religious.

Mr. Payne. If ever I be a christian, I will be a *rational* christian.

Father Goodal. I would not have you to be an *irrational* one. I am a rational christian—at least, I profess to be *rational* in every thing.

Mr. Payne. And do you believe nothing that you cannot give a reason for?

Father Goodal. Nothing.

Mr. Payne. And what reason can you give for believing that Jesus Christ is the *Son* of God?

Father Goodal. Because God said that he was his Son; and no one in the universe could introduce so great a stranger into our world, but the God of the universe. My first and best reason, then, for believing that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God, is, that God himself introduced him by a voice from his throne, and by the visible descent of his Spirit, as his Son. If you were to introduce to me such a lad as Charles Fowler as your son, I would believe you and receive him as such, especially regarding you to be a man of honor and veracity.

Mr. Payne. But it is very easy to believe an honest man, who testifies that such a person is his son, because we all know and understand that men have sons; but how can *God* have a Son?

Father Goodal. Strange! And is not the word of God as good as that of an honest man?

Mr, Payne. That is not the point, Mr. Goodal. I admit that: but I can *understand* how a man may have a son, but I cannot understand how God can have a Son. I wish to understand what I believe.

Father Goodal. And is it unreasonable to think that the God of the universe could give men the power of having sons, and yet not have such power himself! If God has given to us wisdom, goodness, power, mercy, compassion, is it not proof that he has wisdom, power, goodness, &c. himself? And if he have given us sons, is it not rational to believe him when he says that he has himself a Son?

Mr. Payne. I cannot comprehend how God can have a Son, and therefore it is to me difficult of belief.

Mr. Cunningham. And it is just as incomprehensible for man to understand how God, who is himself a *spirit*, can have a Spirit. God is a spirit; and yet there is a spirit of a Spirit!! How can this be?

Mr. Reed. Gentlemen, whenever you divest religion of mystery, you divest it of all divinity, and of all worth.

Mr. Payne. Surprising, Mr. Reed! Do you go for mysteries in religion?

Mr. Reed. Certainly I do. I go for mysteries in God—mysteries in nature—mysteries in man—mysteries in all things.

Mr. Cunningham. Then I never can be the dupe of mysteries; for if I begin to believe mysteries, I do not know where to stop. Then come all the mysteries of Mystery Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots—the Seven Mysteries of Popery, &c. &c.

Mr. Reed. Then you can never be rational nor religious; for no man can act rationally nor religiously who repudiates mysteries from creation, providence, and redemption.

Father Goodal. Mr. Reed, you ought to explain the term: for I think you do not understand one another.

Mr. Reed. Then I ask the gentlemen what they mean by the word *mystery?*

Mr. Payne. I mean something awfully obscure, and contrary to experience and reason.

Digitized by Google

Mr. Reed. Might not a matter be awfully obscure, and neither contrary to reason nor experience: as for example, how a human bone is first formed—how the cranium, which is so much harder than the brain, should be indented by the brain—how an egg becomes hard, and an apple soft by boiling.

Mr. Cunningham. I beg leave to make an effort to improve on Mr. Payne's definition. I would say that a mystery is something impenetrably dark and incomprehensible.

Mr. Reed. But is not the *art of printing* called a *mystery;* and is it not in truth a mystery to those who are not initiated into it? Is it incomprehensible?

Mr. Payne. And how would you, Mr. Reed, define a mystery?

Mr. Reed. I would say that any thing not comprehended, whether in its nature comprehensible or incomprehensible, is a mystery; navigation, surveying, dialling, are all mysteries to the untaught; but they are not incomprehensible. Magnetism, the vital principle, are mysteries not yet comprehended; but, perhaps, not incomprehensible. God, or the first cause, is a mystery in; comprehensible as to his self-existence, eternity, ubiquity, omnipotence, &c.

Mr. Payne. Then I believe some things that are mysterious—that is,. some things which I cannot explain nor comprehend.

Mr. Reed. And so does every man in the world admit even principles of action, rules of conduct, which he cannot comprehend.

Father Goodal. My friends, there is nothing like explaining the terms. Many a strife would have been prevented, and many a controversy would have been soon terminated, if men had only spent a few minutes in understanding one another. You all believe in mysteries, properly so called—some of which may not always be incomprehensible: others may continue to be incomprehensible while life endures.

Mr. Reed. It would be marvellous, indeed, if nature, the work of God, would be full of secrets—awfully obscure: and that the Bible, giving a revelation of the self-existent Creator, Preserver, and Redeemer of man—of his wonderful works, his existence, perfections, schemes, designs, and interpositions, should be free from all matters obscure and incomprehensible!

Mr. Cunningham. I was wont to attend the Unitarian meeting in Glasgow, and I heard so much about rational christianity, and so much against the belief of mysteries, that I confess I supposed that a rational christian did not believe in mysteries.

Father Goodal. Then a rational christian cannot be a man: for atheism, deism, epicureanism, Judaism, scepticism, and every other *ism* is full of mysteries. The christian, I opine, who believes God and his Spirit, has fewer mysteries to contend with than any other person in existence.

Mr. Payne. But is there not less mystery in Unitarian Christianity than in Trinitarian Christianity?

Mr. Reed. There are not two kinds of Christianity.

Mr. Payne. Call them systems of religious belief, then.

Mr. Reed. There is much incomprehensible jargon in both.

Mr. Payne. But is there not some comparative excellence in the one more than the other?

Mr. Reed. I never could discover that the Trinitarian, Unitarian, or Sabellian hypothesis had any superior claims or pretensions to offer for popular acceptance.

Mrs. Fowler. So long as we read of God, the Son of God, the Spirit of God, in the Bible, not any one of these systems has, to me, any preference upon the score of rationality, simplicity, or acceptibility.

Mr. Reed. A god that every one can comprehend, and whose mode of existence and operation are every way comprehensible, must be a wooden god—not the living and true God, who is from eternity to eternity, the self-existent, life-giving, and life-preserving God—who spans the heavens, fills time, space, and eternity—in whom we live, move, and have our being—who, by a single volition expressed, created the universe. This God is the incompre-

Digitized by Google

hensible, the adorable, the wonderful, suited to all our conceptions drawn from the extent, variety, and immensity of his dominions.

Mr. Cunningham. But could he have a Son as godlike as himself and a Spirit too?

Father Goodal. Will you permit me to say it is just as conceivable that God could, *for any purpose*, exist in three as in one, and that each of these could possess every attribute that belongs to Divinity as fully as Adam, Eve, and Abel possessed one common nature, though differently derived in each. I say, it is as conceivable to my mind that God could, with a reference to creation, to the universe, to redemption, or to any purpose, exist in three as in one, and in one as in three, as that the three persons already mentioned could possess one common nature, and each possess it in full—for what is *three* and and what is *one* when applied to *infinity!!* Little mortals like us, mere unit particles, cannot put together three ideas in one, nor one in three; and because of our inability, we presume to say that there could not be one Father, one Son, and one Spirit—and yet one God!!

Mr. Reed. That is too speculative and too abstruse for our weak heads.

Father Goodal. And that Jesus should be called the Son of God, and that his spirit should be called the Spirit of God, and that we christians should have but one God whom we worship and adore, is also too abstruse and too speculative for my weak head. We are all weak—all vanity. Creatures of yesterday, we know nothing. Well, I will only say that I believe in one God, one Son of God, one Spirit of God, and still I will believe in one God; so that I am a Trinitarian-Unitarian and a Unitarian-Trinitarian!

Mr. Payne. It is too mysterious for me: I do not see so much difficulty in supposing that God being a unit, begat by his own volition one before all time from himself, who being *of* and from himself, necessarily partook of all divine perfections; and that from these two proceeded a third, the conjoint offspring of both, though as divine as either—just as from Adam God made Eve, and then from these two made a third person.

Mr. Reed. By this time we are all convinced that speculation is boundless and indefinite. I am for what is written, and only for what is written; and all the rest I leave to them whose heads are stronger than mine.

Father Goodal. This has always been my choice. But I can exchange my thoughts by the fireside with any friend or brother, and hear his without imposing mine on him, or getting angry with him if he will not say I am right. I will also hear him with all candor: but when the question of faith comes up, I *believe* just as far as the testimony goes and no farther, and I demand no more from a brother. When the testimony closes, my faith ends—and all the rest is with me matter of opinion.

Mr. Reed. But I can scarcely recall the point of our departure from Peter's confession.

Mrs. Reed. I am still more and more for *faith.* I can believe more than I can comprehend, and I feel more certainty in my faith than I do in my reasonings—only let me have good testimony! When I was a child I walked by faith, and was happy—when advanced in life I began to reason, and I became dubious and unhappy. In all things supernatural I am still a *babe*, and in this state I expect to be a babe, and will always be governed by faith. I will use my reason in deciding into whose hands I will commit myself: but having committed myself into the care of an infallible guide, I will implicitly follow him. This is the best account I can give of myself.

Mr. Payne. Might not a Papist, a Mahomedan, a Jew say as much as you have now said, and be as happy too.

Mrs. Reed. They might *say* more; but I have *done* more. I have compared the pretensions of the Pope, of Mahomet, and I have examined the reasons why the Jews refused Jesus. And so far my reason with the documents furnished, was, I think, a competent guide; and having an overwhelming mass of evidence in favor of the pretensions of Jesus, I give myself up to

Digitized by Google

him, and I believe him in all he says, with the most perfect confidence, and feel quite at ease.

Mr. Payne. If I understand you, you decided on the comparative merits of the Pope, Mahomet, and Jesus; and finding a greater weight of argument on the side of the latter than on that of either of the former, you yielded. Well now, Madam, if a fourth leader, with greater pretensions of a divine mission, were to appear, would you not, on your own principles, be compelled to desert Jesus and betake yourself to him.

Mrs. Reed. That is impossible; for two persons giving a different testimony of each other, equally supported by supernatural attestations, is utterly impos. ble. For example—Jesus said that he was THE LIGHT of the world, the *Messiah*, the only *Saviour:* and he was supported in these pretensions by all necessary documental proof. Now if any other person were to appear, making any pretensions contrary to these, it is impossible to conceive that God would sustain him by any attestations whatever.

Mr. Payne. And do you think the Holy Spirit bears testimony to the pretensions of Jesus of Nazareth as the Son of God.

Mrs. Reed. As much as he ever did, both externally and internally. Externally in all that is sealed by miracles and prophecies: and internally, in the hearts of believers.

Mr. Payne. This is what I feared was the issue of christian faith!

Mrs. Reed. What!

Mrs. Payne. What in England we call Methodism, some call *enthusiasm;* some, *new-lightism;* and some, *fanaticism.* I do not mean, Madam, I assure you, that you are either an English Methodist, or an enthusiast, or fanatic: by no means. I have every reason to think otherwise. But what I mean is, that all fanaticism and enthusiasm grow out of these views; and when I hear you speak so rationally on religion in general, and after all see you take shelter in that common assylum of all the visionaries, I am still more and more alarmed for myself.

Mrs. Reed. What assylum?

Mr. Payne. The Spirit of God in the heart bearing witness that you are right—infallibly right.

Mrs. Reed. Not so fast, if you please, Mr. Payne. I have not said all that.

Mr. Payne. I beg your pardon, Madam: I so understood you.

Mrs. Reed. Is there no *mean* between extremes? Is there nothing between cold rationalism, and flaming enthusiasm?

Mr. Payne. O that I could see that GOLDEN MEAN. If there be any *terra firma* between these antipodes, it is to me a *terra incognita*—a land unknown!

Mrs. Reed. There is a religion all letter, form, ceremony, reason, and no spirit: there is, too, a religion all spirit; no letter, form, ceremony, testimony, nor reason. The former pure Unitarianism, if you please: the latter, Quakerism, if you will allow me to illustrate by living examples.

Mr. Payne. Certainly, Madam. But where is the temperate zone!

Mrs. Reed. Just in religion where it is in nature—*between the burning and the frozen zones.* The Unitarians live within the polar circles; and the Methodists and Quakers between the tropics, in the torrid zone! Theirs is the region of dead calms, or of storms and tempests.

Mr. Payne. Well, Madam, you seem to have got hold of my ears; and I confess I *feel* like believing you; but if you will present to me a view of religion which is not all letter, all *writing*, all *ink* and *paper*, or all *spirit, visions, dreams*, and *impulses*, I will be your convert.

Mrs. Reed. I would rather you had said Christ's convert! Well, now, just such a religion is the religion of the Apostles of Christ. The Spirit gave all the supernatural ideas found in the Apostle's writings, confirmed them by its various gifts or distributions; and by these words and signs it still speaks to the sons of men.

In its SIGNS *it addresses unbelievers—in its* WORDS *it speaks to believers.* By its *signs* it convinces the understanding—by its *words* it speaks to the heart.

Digitized by Google

By its *signs* it stands before the door—by its *words* it enters into the soul. By its *signs* it captivates the outward man—by its *words* it renews and quickens the inward man. Hence the Spirit of God is *felt* in the heart by all christians, and *resisted* by all unbelievers.

But it neither adds to, nor subtracts from, what is written: for its revelations are complete. It suggests no original ideas; but by the words already spoken it makes us *see* and *feel* the power of God in giving life, and joy, and peace, and love, and heaven within.

I have no idea of *naked spirit* in religion more than I have of *naked divinity* in nature, in giving me food and raiment; but I do not regard the mere elements without the divinity, nor the word without the Spirit of God in giving life to saint or sinner.

Mr. Payne. Repeat that again, Mrs. Reed.

EDITOR.

To Mr. William Jones, of London.

Letter III.

My much esteemed and venerable brother Jones,

YOUR *fourth* question is thus stated: "Do you allow small societies to communicate in the Lord's supper without a Pastor? I think I have learned from brother Wyeth that this is done in some instances; and if so, upon what principles is it justified; and where do you draw the line beyond which it may not be done? I need not tell you what a bone of contention this has been amongst our churches in England, Scotland, and Ireland."

I was, indeed, conversant with this controversy while in Ireland and Scotland, and recollect to have read, without much interest, however, while there, some pieces from Dr. Watts of Glasgow, and others in England and Ireland. The impression made at that time upon my mind was, that if ever I should become a *public* advocate for Jesus Christ and his institution, I would one day examine the matter *ab initio*, and ascertain, if possible, from the apostolic writings and primitive antiquity, what the views and practice of the first christians were on this, as well as on all other subjects. I have long since been satisfied on this subject; and will, in a few words, offer the reasons and considerations which have directed my own course; and I am happy to state that many congregations now in this highly favored land have come to the same conclusions:—

We discover that although uninspired men have drawn artificial lines between the different parts of social worship, partitioning it out, or, I might say, farming it out to particular offices and officers in the congregation—the Apostles, prime ministers of the new government, placed all the parts of social worship on the same footing. Hence, after the immersion of the first fruits on Pentecost, all the *immersed* continued steadfast in the teaching, in the fellowship, in the breaking of the loaf, in the prayers of the Apostles, praising the Lord. Why commentators and interpreters should have made the Apostles *adjectives* to the doctrine, and not to the fellowship, breaking of the loaf,

Digitized by Google

and prayers, has not been revealed to me either by the Greeks, Romans, or English. The juxtaposition of the doctrine and the Apostles in the original may have beguiled some into the notion that the Apostles' doctrine was something different from the other things mentioned; but to me it appears, that, if we confine the epithet *apostles* to the word *doctrine*, then it must read, "They continued steadfast in the Apostles' doctrine or teaching—even in the fellowship, in the breaking of the loaf, and in the prayers." Indeed, they could know nothing of these matters but from the Apostles; and therefore the Apostles' teaching respected these parts of the christian institution. As yet there were no bishops nor deacons; but *the disciples*, the three thousand one hundred and twenty, continued steadfast in all these parts of the *social* or *christian worship*.

If the Apostles authorized or officiated in one, they authorized all and officiated in all. But all that I argue from this passage, is, that every part of the worship of the congregation is alike sacred, solemn, and instructive; and that he who is qualified to take a part in one, as far as *authority* is regarded, is qualified to officiate in all.

Again, it does not appear that even after bishops and deacons were set apart, that they were ordained for this purpose; for on all occasions, when allusion is found to the breaking of the loaf, it seems to be regarded as common to all the disciples as much as prayer or praise, or any other part of the christian institution.

Thus *the disciples* at Troas, *as such*, came together on the first day of the week *to break the loaf*. Paul's stay there, and the part he took on that occasion, gives no countenance to the popular idea that *he* broke the loaf for them. Many, indeed, of our American christians are such babes in the new institution, that they imagine Paul's breaking bread on the *second* day of the week, (that is, on our Sunday night,) was the Lord's supper, not observing that the first day of the week then ended wish the going down of the sun on our *political Sunday*. And I do not know (for I never asked) but that the Methodists found their practice of taking "the sacrament" on Monday at their camp meetings in America, from the fact that Paul became hungry after midnight on the second day of the week, and partook of a collation for his refreshment, that he might continue his speech till near day light on the second day of the week. We Americans are such Romans that we can never learn that "the evening and the morning made the first day of the week." In spite of Moses and King James, we will read it, "And the morning and the evening made the first day"!

"The *disciples* then came together" on the first day of the week "to break the loaf." Paul staid with them to *the morrow*, partook with them on the Lord's day, and refreshed himself by a common collation the evening of the second day, so that he might depart early in the morning of that day, on his journey to Jerusalem.

Once more on this subject: When Paul addressed the congregation at Corinth on the subject of the supper, he speaks neither to bishops nor deacons, (if they had any,) but to the whole congregation, *as such*,

Digitized by Google

for their abuse of the sacred ordinance. If bishops they had, one thing will not be disputed—either they had nothing to do, *ex officio*, with the supper; or if they had, they were not qualified to rule well, or were a very irresponsible sort of public functionaries. And might I add, that in all the duties assigned the bishops of the christian congregations, that of specially breaking the loaf is no where mentioned in all the apostolic writings.

But here comes the problem that for some time perplexed me. In ancient times congregations existed for some time without elders or bishops; for we see from the sacred history itself, as well as from the nature of the case, that bishops were not chosen at the time of the organization of the congregations. Thus Paul and Barnabas, on their return to Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, ordained them *seniors* in every church which they had formerly planted; and, from all the circumstances, after a considerable interval from the first planting of these congregations. And, indeed, we cannot see how it was possible for any congregation, unless gifted with the faculty of discerning not merely doctrines, but *spirits*, to make a selection of well tried and approved persons to preside over them in the Lord, unless after the lapse of some considerable time. Now during this interval either there was a foreign supply of bishops to break the loaf to them, or they did it themselves every Lord's day. If I were reasoning on this subject with a modern sectary, I would offer a trilemma rather than a dilemma. I would say the loaf was not broken at all for those months or years, during which a congregation had no bishop; or if broken, it was broken by the bishops of other congregations, or by the unofficial disciples themselves. But the English, Scotch, Irish, and American reformers of this century all agree in this, that the celebration of the Lord's supper and the Lord's day were inseparably connected; that no christian community commemorated the resurrection that did not commemorate the sacrifice of the Messiah; that the evidence and proof for a weekly observance of the Lord's day and the Lord's supper are identically the same as far as New Testament history goes, and the reason, nature, and utility of things go. In fact, we cannot have a *christian week* at all without the *Lord's day* and the *Lord's supper*. And I will add, I never read, till since the Man of Sin assumed the *triple* crown, that there was a monthly Lord's day, a quarterly Lord's day, or a semi-annual *first day*, as was the case while I sojourned in the land of *St. Andrew*. In my youthful days they had but *two Lord's days* in the year in Scotland.

In America, too, the Baptists, like other sects, have got a week of 30 days, or only *twelve Lord's days* in the year. But the Presbyterians have reformed much in these United States; for while their Scotch and Irish fathers have but two Lord's days in the year, the General Assembly of this Union have doubled their zeal and piety, and usually have four Lord's days in one year.

But I have only to offer a *dilemma* to my English brethren who may happen yet to entertain the popish idea of *official grace* still flowing down in a regular sacerdotal stream through all the leaky

Digitized by Google

carcases of papistic and prelatic priests, from the worm-eaten legs of St. Peter's chair, seized with the dry rot seventeen hundred years ago. How grace can emanate from such a putrid carcase, would puzzle sages more learned than those of Philistina, dumb-stricken by Samson's riddle.

That dilemma is:—Either the first churches weekly broke the loaf themselves in the capacity of private citizens, or they imported bishops from abroad! We were long since compelled to choose that position most accordant (in our judgment) with the scope of the whole volume, and the Holy Spirit of the gospel, and to decide that all societies called churches, large or small, should meet for social worship on the Lord's day; and that the disciples, when thus assembled, choosing for the day, or time present, their most gifted brethren, should continue steadfast in hearing the Apostles, in the fellowship, in breaking the loaf, and in prayers, praising God.

It is not, indeed, so difficult for Americans to learn this lesson as for Englishmen. We are taught from the cradle that *all power is in the people.* The *sovereign* people in America can create and they can destroy. With us all officers derive their power from the sovereign people, and we hold all public functionaries as our *creatures*, the workmanship of our hands, and our responsible *servants.* In the christian community, then, we find little difficulty in choosing out and creating servants when we want them, because we are all *sovereigns*, and can delegate all sorts of powers at pleasure.

But, my dear brother, we should very much regret if our English brethren should thence infer that either we are a disorderly people, or that we regard the bishop's office as an unnecessary appendage to the christian institution. Very far from it, we assure you. We can discriminate between liberty and licentiousness—between despotism and anarchy. We are for order—good order in all the christian communities, large and small. Hence no one acts either *pro tempore* an elder or overseer for a single day, but by the choice or appointment of the brethren.

Suppose even one dozen of persons have agreed to give themselves not only to the Lord, but to one another, in a holy covenant or bond of brotherhood in Christ, to walk in all his ways, and to help one another in their journey to the heavenly city; on coming together for the first time they will select some persons, who, by their vote, may officiate as seniors or overseers for the time being. Now these brethren, thus appointed *pro tempore*, may keep all good order in their meetings, and preside in all the parts of their christian worship. Thus they *first prove* who will be worthy of consecration to the bishop's office. We all, too, incline to follow the first congregations in the notion of a *plurality* of elders in *every church.* But really we have much more need for overseers in the congregations for other purposes, than to break the loaf or to give thanks for the cup. While it is comely that one should preside at the Lord's table with all gracefulness and solemnity, we regard the loaf or cup as receiving no *virtue* from *official* hands, nor more useful or holy to him that receives

Digitized by Google

it first from the bishop's or deacon's hands, than it is to him who receives it last from the hands of the humblest brother or sister in the Lord's family.

Experience is fast teaching us that no part of the christian institution is unnecessary or redundant. We want *elders* in every congregation, a presbytery in every church, at least in every one that has members enough to require their attention. Congregations varying, as ours do, from ten members to five hundred, of course will call for an equally disproportionate oversight.

"Ruling with diligence," or presiding over the house of God with care, is a great matter, and essential to the prosperity of the congregations and the general interests of the gospel in the world. But unfortunately we have lost the model of a christian bishop; and in all the varieties of priests and clergy, from the daily and weekly sermonizers, up to his mitred and downy Grace of York, there is not to be found one class of men in any party that fills up the outlines of all that I find in the Christian Scriptures, embraced in four sentences:—"*Laboring* in the word and teaching;" "*Naturally caring for*," and "*feeding* the flock of God;" and "*Ruling* well, as those that must give account."

So long as the notion obtains that clergymen are created, made, and ordained to dispense ordinances, to *christen infants*, to *confirm children*, to marry adults, to *dispense the sacrament*, to pray for the sick, to preach funeral sermons, and march in funeral processions—to be chaplains to armies, navies, and parliaments, and to write and pronounce sermons—we have infallible testimony that we are in the spiritual Babylonian Captivity, and that christians will in this state neither know nor enjoy their privileges. Some other items in your letter may demand from me a few remarks in my next.

May you ever enjoy the protection of the Good Shepherd, the Chief Shepherd, and Bishop of our souls!

EDITOR.

The Rev. Mr. Landis---again.

MR. LANDIS is, I understand, an immersed Presbyterian Minister and Pastor of a Presbyterian congregation. His views of Acts ii. 38. are given below. He as much misunderstands us as the Calvinists and Arminians misunderstand Paul's epistle to the Romans. But it will be gratifying to the curious to have his interpretation of Acts ii. 38. placed along side of some hundred expositions given of it by the Baptists and Paidobaptists of the last ten or twelve years. On this passage he has conceded every thing for which I have ever contended. Mr. Meredith and he are not far from the kingdom of heaven on this point! Would that they were as nigh it on all others! I have not leisure now to expatiate on this concession, nor on the attempt to justify himself in opposing us on the ground of his imputations. He greatly misunderstands or misrepresents our views of christian im-

Digitized by Google

mersion. I have just as much faith in the infallibility of the Pope, as I have in any man's *deserving* pardon of his sins by faith, repentance, baptism, or prayer. Can he not distinguish between *means of enjoyment* and means of purchase or procurement?

It will require all the logic in the little state of Delaware, to show that any thing less or more than Peter required to remission on Pentecost, is requisite to invest Americans with all the same blessings vouchsafed through faith, repentance, and immersion, to the three thousand of the *first fruits*. ED. M. H.

"*Argument founded on Acts* ii. 38.—*answered.*

This passage thus reads: "*Repent and be baptized*, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins;*" and from it the Campbellites argue that *baptism is as intimately connected with remission of sins as repentance is:* and, of course, remission of sins cannot be obtained without baptism, any more than it can without repentance. *And therefore, baptism is as essential to salvation as repentance is.*

I think it will not be disputed that the idea contained in this passage, may, with propriety and correctness, be thus expressed: "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *that your sins may be remitted.*" This, though not a literal rendering, is evidently contained in *eis ephesin amartian.* In our translation the word "*for*" conveys a meaning which is not supported by the original. The word is *eis*, "*unto*," and not *gar*, "*for.*" Repent and be baptized *unto* the remission of sins." In fact, if I mistake not, this is the idea as given by Mr. C. himself: "Reform and be each of you immersed in the name of Jesus Christ, *in order to the remission of sins*," i. e. (as I understand it,) "*that your sins may be remitted.*" The text thus expressed conveys the idea that *repentance and baptism were the terms on which God would grant unto them remission of sins.* It steers clear of the Campbellite idea that they would *deserve* remission of sins if they repented and were baptized: and simply conveys the idea that *these were the terms* on which God would be pleased to grant them remission.

But not to insist on this criticism, as its correctness may be questioned by sticklers for "the *literal* rendering," we will pass it by without further remark, and proceed to observe—

That the peculiar circumstances of the case mentioned in Acts ii. 38. render it a *particular instance*, in the strictest sense of that term: and it is illogical, and utterly out of the question to draw *general* conclusions from it, and apply them to the *present* circumstances of *mankind at large.* While I freely allow that in the case of the persons there spoken of, baptism was essential to the remission of sins; yet I positively deny that this case affords us any ground to conclude that baptism is essential to the remission of sins in *every case.* But unless this can be maintained, the passage confessedly affords not the least support to the system which I am opposing. A few remarks will show how very peculiar their circumstances were:—

1. The persons here spoken of, must either have obeyed the command, and have been baptized, or have remained open and avowed enemies to the cause of Christ. It is needless to remark, that while they remained thus, it would have been utterly impossible for them to have received remission of sins.

2. It was the best evidence that they could give mankind of their sincerity in renouncing Judaism and embracing Christianity.

3. *They*, circumstanced as they were, could not even *innocently* mistake, or misunderstand the command. The Apostles were present, and if any difficulty occurred in understanding it, it could be easily and promptly obviated. It was not, therefore, *even possible* for them to be in error respecting their duty on this subject. And,

4th. They had ample time and opportunity to obey the command.

Digitized by Google

Now, not to obey it under such circumstances, would argue an impenitent, unhumbled heart. And to the possessor of such a heart, remission of sins *could not be granted.* And hence baptism was essential to the remission of *their* sins.

And *in the same sense* as baptism was essential to the remission of sins in this case, it is also essential to the remission of sin at the present time: e. g. when it is admitted that baptism is positively enjoined by Christ upon all his followers; and when there is time, and opportunity to obey the command. Under these circumstances, I do most earnestly contend, that no one can be in a salvable state while he lives in the open violation of this command. We have no more right, under these circumstances, to dispense with this, than with any other acknowledged command of the Saviour."

Reformation---No. 3.

A PERSONAL CONCERN.

REFORMATION, like salvation, is a personal affair. Men are not saved naturally, or constitutionally, but individually; and, therefore, individually they must reform. To reform is "to cease to do evil and to learn to do well" according to the Bible; but, according to the too popular theory, *to reform* is to change the creed, the party, or the form of church government. But, with us, *to repent* is to change our views, or to be sorry for the past; but *to reform* is, first cease to do evil, and then learn to do well. A reformer, then, first *stops*—before he begins.

When a person is converted he has only turned his face towards God, and his back towards Satan. But turning one's face towards London does not bring him one step nearer the city. He that is converted begins to walk with God, or towards heaven.

It is a great matter, however, *to turn:* for until a person turns his face towards London, he cannot possibly approach it. To cease to do evil must, in the nature of things, precede the beginning to do well. But yet if a person has *only ceased* to do evil, he has not *begun* to do well. And if a person could cease from doing every evil thing, his virtue (if virtue it might be called) would be wholly of the negative kind.

But such are the extravagant notions of some folks about reformation, that they think that if they have ceased to do some evil, they have begun to do good; as if he that robbed A, and stopped before he reached the property of B, has done good to B by only robbing A! Negative good, like latent caloric, warms no person.

Others think that when they have been immersed they have *done* something worthy of praise: nay, verily, they only have *received* something worthy of thanks. He that is immersed does nothing, any more than he who is buried. In immersion, as in being born, and in being buried, the subject is always passive. He that immerses another does something: but he that is immersed has only suffered something. When we talk of the *act* of immersion we have the agent, not the subject, in our eye. He, however, who is acceptably immersed, has been immersed as one that is dead—not as one that is alive. It

Digitized by Google

is criminal to bury a man alive: but kind and virtuous to bury him that is dead.

True, indeed, that he that has died to sin is *willing* to be buried with Christ, and it is his own volition that puts his person into the the hands of the baptist;* but when in the hands of the baptist he is, and ought to feel himself, as passive as he that is coffined. He that buries him will raise him out of the element; and this being *the faith* of the subject, he is always immersed in the *hope* of being raised out of the water, as the christian who dies in Christ hopes for the resurrection of the just.

He who has, on his own *dying confession* of faith and repentance, been immersed, is only converted—he has only received the remission of his sins—he has only been born into the kingdom—he has only entered on the race—he has only enlisted in the Army of the Faith—he has yet to form a christian character. If he ever wears a crown, he must win it. Grace has proposed it, and Grace will put it on his head; but instrumentally by the obedience of faith he lays hold of the prize, and through a patient, or rather *persevering continuance in doing well*, Grace chooses to confer the boon of eternal life.

But in order, be it remembered, to learning to do well, a person must cease to do evil. A true reformer, then, begins by putting off the old man with his deeds, and then putting on the new—not putting on the new man upon the old man, but by putting off the old man before he puts on the new. I do not speak thus as if a person was to occupy a certain time in putting off the old man, and then to occupy a certain time in putting on the new. It is simply *ceasing* to do evil and then *learning* to do well.

All such persons are reformers, and none else. And if any one ask what are the evils to be put off, let him consult Paul, who, in all his epistles, has detailed the evils with infallible certainty and with heavenly perspicuity.

Paul will teach him that a reformer is one who rises early in the morning—calls upon the name of the Lord—speaks evil of no man—backbites not his neighbor, nor easily takes up an evil report against him—minds his own business all the day—engages in all works of benevolence and mercy to which he can aspire—is industrious, frugal, lives within his income, has generally something to give to him that is in distress—honest to a scruple, and honorable in all things. If he be so fortunate as to have a wife, he loves her, and treats her with all kindness and sympathy. If he have been blessed with children he takes care of them, provides for them, and educates them in the fear of the Lord. If he be rich in this world, he is rich in good works—humble and thankful; and he is constantly contriving how he may be reaping in heaven, for a thousand years to come, a joyful harvest of those who will owe their happiness to his good works. If he be poor, he is content, unrepining, and thankful to God that he is rich in faith and an heir of the kingdom. If he be a master, he always

*Baptist is a term which only correctly applies to him that immerses. Being baptized never can make a person a baptist; but he that baptizes another is a baptist.

Digitized by Google

remembers that he has a Master in heaven, and gives to his servant what is just and equal: if a servant, he works for Jesus Christ; and, of course, if by the day, he is faithful—and if by the job, he is honest.

He is early to church on the Lord's day morning, and his seat is never empty, unless in case of some extraordinary occurrence. He always has the Living Oracles in his hand in the congregation, except when the service of the Lord calls him to some act of worship. He sings and prays with spirit, in the Spirit, and with good sense. His *Amen* is heard in the assembly of the saints; and what he learns on the Lord's day he practises through the week. Such a man is a reformer; and of such a one no christian on earth, or saint in heaven, ought to be ashamed.

EDITOR

Paul's Allusions to Ancient Customs.

NO. II.

THE following distinguished passage in Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians, chapter ix. abounds with agonistical terms. Its beautiful and striking imagery is totally borrowed from the Greek stadium. "Know ye not, that they who run in a race, run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain. And every man that striveth for the mastery, is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible. I therefore so run, not as uncertainly, so fight I, not as one that beateth the air: but I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached the gospel to others, I myself should be a cast-away." Know you not that in the Grecian stadium great numbers run with the utmost contention to secure the prize, but that only one person wins and receives?—With the same ardor and perseverance do you run, that you may seize the garland of celestial glory. Every one also, who enters the lists as a combatant, submits to a very rigid and severe regimen.—They do this to gain a fading chaplet that is only composed of the decaying leaves of a wild olive, but in *our* view is hung up the unfading wreath of immortality. With this in full prospect, I run the Christian race—not distressed with wretched uncertainty concerning its final issue—I engage as a combatant—but deal not my blows in empty air. But I inure my body to the severest discipline, and bring all its appetites into subjection; lest when I have proclaimed the glorious prize to others, I should at last be rejected as unworthy to obtain it. This representation of the christian race must have made a strong impression upon the minds of the Corinthians, as they were so often spectators of these games, which were celebrated on the Isthmus, upon which their city was situated. It is very properly introduced with, "Know you not;" for every citizen in Corinth was acquainted with every minute circumstance of

Digitized by Google

this most splendid and pompous solemnity.—Paul, in like manner, in his second epistle to Timothy, chap. ii. ver. 5. observes, "That if a man strive for mastery, yet is he not crowned, unless he strive lawfully:" He who contends in the Grecian games, secures not the crown, unless he strictly conform to the rules prescribed.

What hath been observed concerning the spirit and ardor, with which the competitors engaged in the race, and concerning the prize they had in view to reward their arduous contention, will illustrate the following sublime passage of the same sacred writer in his epistle to the Philippians, chap. iii. ver. 12——14. "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press towards the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus:" Not that already I have acquired this palm: not that I have already attained perfection—but I pursue my course, that I may seize the crown of immortality, to the hope of which I was raised by the graciousness appointment of Christ Jesus. My Christian brethren, I do not esteem myself to have obtained this glorious prize: but one thing occupies my whole attention—forgetting what I left behind, I stretch every nerve towards the prize before me, pressing with eager and rapid steps, towards the goal to seize the immortal palm, which God, by Christ Jesus, bestows. This affecting passage also, of the same Apostle, in the second epistle of Timothy, written a little before his martyrdom, is beautifully allusive to the above mentioned race, to the crown that awaited the victor, and to the Hellanodics or judges who bestowed it. "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my *course*, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but to all them also that love his appearing.

The chaplet that was bestowed on the victor in the olympic games, was made of wild olive, the crowns in the Isthmian games were made of parsley. These crowns were fading and transitory.

H.

Letter from Dr. John Thomas.

RICHMOND, *Va.* November 17, 1834.

Dear brother Campbell,

NEED I apologize for not writing to you since my arrival at this city If I must, I would plead your own excuse with your own correspondents—that if you cannot take liberties with your friends, with whom can you? It is to them you look for indulgence in the affairs of epistolary replication. Procrastination is a thievish thing, and often robs of time, friends, and eternity, those who listen to its appeals. Notwithstanding many and pressing engagements arising from the practice of my profession; travelling, the proclamation of the glad tidings at home and abroad, the business of the *Advocate*, and re-

Digitized by Google

plies to correspondents—I still feel certain qualms of conscience, which will no longer permit me to remain in silence. My obligation to you and brother Scott is great; the full extent of which I shall only comprehend when we sit down together at the table of our King in the kingdom of God. When at sea, in imminent peril of shipwreck, beating on the sands of Sable Island, and surrounded by the subjects of despair, my vow ascended to Heaven, that if ever I was permitted to set foot on *terra firma*, I would not rest until I found the true religion. Circumstances led me to Cincinnati. I set out upon a tour *of religious houses* in that city. I went first to the Baptist church under the superintendence of W. Lynd. The food was husky; I could by no means swallow it. I next heard brother Challen. I shall not attempt to describe the satisfaction I experienced in listening to his address They said he was "a Campbellite." I had never heard of such *ites* as these in England; though I remembered a caution I had received from a Baptist preacher in New York to beware of Campbellism. You know I am rather of an *independent* turn; in fact, I once belonged to the Independents—and therefore, the name had no terrors for me. But, thought I, if what I have heard be Campbellism, it is one of the most delightful, scriptural, intelligible, and intellectual *isms* I ever heard defended. I determined to hear it again. In the mean time brother Scott encountered me, and baptized me, not into your *ism*, but into Christ, and thus I became a Christian, and found at last the true religion. Up to this period I had not read a page of your writings, and yourself I did not know from Adam, For my first acquaintance with you I am indebted to our beloved brother Gano. I trust I may never forget his kindness—may we meet again hereafter happily! Much of my darkness your writings dissipated by opening the Scriptures; and it was you who first led me to make the study of the sacred writings the prime object of my life. Here is my great obligation to you. No object in nature affords me so much delight as the satisfaction I experience from time to time in discovering new beauties in the Book—of all books the best. I can now look forward, understandingly, to the glorious prospects of the coming age—prospects comprehended in that "lively hope," that "inheritance in light, incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away;" competent to strengthen our faith, increase our courage, and to urge us onward in the pursuit of immortality of body and eternal life. Therefore, I say, the full fruition of these things will alone enable me to appreciate my obligation to you both. But if this be so in relation to you, how do we all stand related in this affair to Him who has redeemed us, and by his gospel turned us from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God? Who can tell the height, and the depth, and the length, and the breadth of the goodness, and wisdom, and philanthropy of God to us ward? None. To him, therefore, be praise, and honor, and glory forever and ever! Amen!

Affairs, I think, are improving somewhat in this part of the world. Since June last I have travelled about 550 miles, attacking the strong holds of Satan—neither asking quarter nor giving any. In some places I put some of the brethren into a great panic; but confidence is restored again. They had been in the custom of regarding the clergy almost as sacred persons; and were very timid in maintaining the truth, lest they should bring a whole house about their ears, suffer in their pecuniary affairs, be called uncharitable, presumptuous, and too confident. They wanted courage to confront their opponents under the imputation that they supposed that all others were wrong but themselves. This all arises from not understanding the Scriptures. I can see some improvement taking place. When they found that a spirit of inquiry was excited among the people, that our assemblies increased instead of diminishing, and that they would listen for three hours together without dispersing. Our brethren began to pluck up courage, and many of them now are convinced that nothing can be effected without the boldest daring. I have been twice to Fredericksburg. We baptized six. You know it is difficult to get the citizens to turn out there at first; but after a little we had good assemblies; notwithstanding, when last there, the Presbyterians did their utmost, by a revival effort, to draw off the

Digitized by Google

people. With all their legerdemain they did not make one convert as far as I can learn. The disciples there are increasing in numbers, consideration, intelligence, and, I hope, in the christian virtues also. The first time I was there the attention of the citizens was drawn to the exhibition of a phantom funeral, in honor of La Fayette. The coffin, without a tenant, was borne on the shoulders of the military to the Episcopal Church, the most influential, I believe, in that city. The company was drawn up rank and file in the "sacred edifice." A reverend priest, more like a woman than a man, in a black gown and bands, and his jolly face clean shorn, occupied the reading desk; while two "Methodist brethren" sat at a respectful and measured distance within the rail. This brotherhood is disowned in England. The Revolution has taught humility to Episcopal Divines! "Let us commence the solemn worship of God," said he of the gown and bands, and he might have added, 'over an empty coffin'! He read his worship out of the Episcopal mass book, as usual with his church of "pure faith, primitive order, and scriptural liturgy," as they call it. After he had done he desecrated the desk by introducing one of the Methodists, who, as soon as he had righted himself, drawled out, "Let us *all* engage in *solemn* prayer." Both saints and sinners. *Query*—How can they call on him on whom they have not believed? Isaac Hinton is reported to have said that to pray with or for sinners is a custom of three thousand years standing; for the Prophet Samuel did it! Isaac is a venerable name: perhaps our friend has a greater predilection for Judaism than for Christianity; if so, then Samuel is a good example for the "anxious bench exercise" of Mr. Hinton's religion. These sectaries have a singular phraseology: !"Solemn prayer." Is not, or ought not, all prayer to be solemn? But, may be these priests sometimes pray in jest; it is necessary, therefore, that their audiences should know when they intend to be solemn. I was invited as one of the *Campbellite Clergy*, as they termed us, to walk in this mock procession. Being no clergyman, and nothing more than a plain healer of the sick, I could not conscientiously accept the invitation: the best I could do, however, was to return thanks for their politeness. I therefore wrote and sent a note, of which this is a copy:—

"*To the Committee on the marshalling of the Obsequies of La Fayette.*

GENTLEMEN,

Having received the honor of an invitation to walk in procession as *one of the clergy*, in honor of this distinguished General's memory, permit me to acknowledge the compliment with all respect that is due, and to add farther, that though a preacher of the *ancient* gospel, neither I, nor my fellow-laborers, have any pretension to, nor do we at all wish to be esteemed as *clergymen*. We beg leave, therefore, most respectfully to decline the polite attention of our patriotic citizen committee on this occasion.

I have the honor to be, &c.

JOHN THOMAS, *M. D.*"

What a mockery it is for these men to prostitute the sacred *name* of the religion of Christ to such sham exhibitions. A *feu de mort* was the finale; upon which it all ended in smoke. The last time I was at F— there was a balloon ascension. The aeronaut sent a card of free admission to the *Rev.* Dr. Du Val, but I was pretermitted! You see what we lose by renouncing clerical privileges! We have persuaded about 50 persons to turn from darkness to light, by being "converted that their sins might be blotted out;" many others have come out of Babylon—others have begun to think; and about half a dozen have relapsed into sectarianism. So that you see some good is doing.

As to the brethren in Richmond, some of us are coming to. When a man has drunk deeply, he falls into a sound sleep, from which it is no easy matter to awake him. He is often a long time coming to. So with us here—we have taken huge draughts of the wine of Babylon, the fumes of which are not easily dissipated. There is great room for improvement among us; and I

Digitized by Google

do hope we shall not rest until we thoroughly amend our lives, manners, customs, and conversation. We are too much afraid of losing our customers if we do not *seem* to pay great deference to their religion. I am afraid we do not sufficiently condemn the world by the excellency of our own walk and conduct. The canker-worm at the root of all, is ignorance of the Scriptures. Our numbers increase. This, however, is no sign of prosperity. We should be highly prosperous if we did but study to know and do the will of our heavenly Father. The orthodox are evidently in a quondary. Their measures are failing them. We have almost shamed them out of their noisy fanaticism. There is an attempt at a Baptist revival here now; but they cannot raise the wind. ——Mr. Fife gets up in the pulpit, takes a text, tells half a dozen death bed stories, in a wretched style, in a pitiful tone of voice, and then invites the sinners to come up to be——O what do you think?—prayed for? No—that is getting out of fashion——but to be introduced, to be talked or conversed with! After sermonizing they call on the people to come up to be instructed! What, speaking for an hour, and no instruction! What an age! I am astonished at the patience with which the people sit and hear the nonsensical nothings that fall from the lips of these pretended successors of the Apostles.

I see brother Johnson is publishing a paper. I wish another name had been selected; for in speaking of periodicals peopl- say *The Harbinger*, *The Messenger*, *The Advocate*, without their adjective titles. I wish him success.

It was determined at Fredericksburg to engage brother Albert Anderson as an evangelist; will you urge upon the churches the imperative duty of employing as many evangelists as possible? I refer you to the 8th number of the *Apostolic Advocate* for particulars concerning brother A. A. The brethren ought not only *voluntarily* to engage to sustain them, but be prompt and faithful in paying their subscriptions. To promise is one thing—to perform, another. Under these heavens and earth, in which dwells unrighteousness, performances are infinitely rarer than promises. *Owe no man any thing*. How can evangelists of the churches obey this excellent precept if the disciples are not faithful in their engagements to them? They necessarily contract obligations on the faith of promises, which they cannot fulfil; and thus bring discredit upon that cause they labor to promote. Is not a *verbal promise* as obligatory upon a christian as if he had subscribed a written and legal instrument? What! shall the christian who professes to depend on the faithfulness of God's promises to him, falsify his own to his brother? Are such the genuine fruits of the gospel? Nay, verily, they are the damnable fruits of Antichrist—fruits that will exclude those who develope them, from the kingdom of God and of Christ. It gives me satisfaction to know that I have not made 50 cts. by preaching. In some instances my travelling expences have not been paid. This, though a loss to me, reflects no honor on those who permit it. You know my finances are circumscribed. I have been under the necessity, in some cases, of plainly telling the brethren who have invited me to go some 40 or 60 miles to preach, that I could only do so on condition they would pay my expences. Is it just that all the burden should fall on the preachers? Is there no difference between paying a clergyman, and defraying the necessary expences of a preacher of the gespel? Does the State treat its public servants in this way? Surely, indeed, the children of this world in some things do show more of justice and consideration in their principles of action than the sons of light! If the State calls a man from his private concerns to labor in the public service, does it not compensate that servant for diverting his attention and services from the interests of his family to the State? It ought to be a rule of conduct with the brethren to do justly and love mercy. If they call a brother away from his business to serve them, and preaching the gospel in the neighborhood of a church is serving that church; for it is the duty of a church to sound out the gospel around them,—they are bound by the principles of honor, justice, and integrity, *to give him so much a day during his absence from home, including his travelling expences*, which it is very easy for them to calculate. If the brother

Digitized by Google

be in circumstances to pay his own charges, the love of that independence which Paul boasted of to the Corinthians, will not permit him to accept a cent. In my own case, I have lost several patients by my absence from home: but this I care not so much about, were my travelling expences forthcoming. I expect my worldly interest to be somewhat affected in my goodmaster's cause; but I do not think the brethren have any right to inflict a farthing of that loss upon the brother whose aid they solicit from time to time. The treasurers of the churches are delinquent in duty if they permit their brethren who proclaim the gospel, to depart without attending to this important item of the diaconate deacon's office.

I have much pleasure in informing you that my mother and sister, whom you saw in New York, have put on Christ since their arrival in England. My father, who is a Baptist clergyman you know, is "studying sermons" less and the Scriptures more. And they write me that had they been in America at the time, he would not have objected to their being baptized by —— ——. He has been reading some of your writings, and brother Scott's Evangelist, with which he is much pleased. Mr. Cushman, of the *Christian Gazette*, charges me with having deserted "the faith of my learned and pious father." This is a sort of *ad captandum vulgus* insinuation. If my father's faith is a learned and pious one, of course it must be perfectly orthodox, and mine consequentially heretical. What adepts at jesuistry are these "reverend divines"!

Give my christian love to all the brethren and sisters at Bethany, and to as many as know me at Wellsburg; also, to Father C————.; I am glad to hear of his health. You see how long a letter I have written to you. I hope it will redeem my character, if it have suffered at all by long silence. I am preparing a synopsis of the Apostacy, genealogically deducing the descent of all the modern orthodox churches from the Mystery of Iniquity, which secretly worked in the Apostles' days. It will appear in the *Advocate*. I shall then give the line of witnesses who have maintained the true faith from the day of Pentecost to the present year.

Adieu; and that health, happiness, and peace may be with you to the day of the Lord! is the sincere and ardent prayer of your affectionate brother in the hope of a glorious immortality at his coming.

JOHN THOMAS.

Our beloved brother *Thomas* will accept of our thanks for his very kind and interesting letter, and pardon us for making it public property. Presuming it to be edifying and useful to the brethren, I cannot, in justice to my views of expediency, withhold it from their perusal. It has afforded me much pleasure to learn that the brethren have called out our much esteemed and beloved brother *Anderson* into the field. And I may add that I have too high a sense of their regard for justice, honor, and the love of God, than to doubt their promptitude and fidelity in holding up his hands by their countenance, their prayers, and their "contributions for the gospel." Too well they know that he that plentifully sows shall plentifully reap, and too highly they appreciate the value of the gospel and the salvation of the Lord, to be either lukewarm or languid in its publication.

Brother Thomas will please accept my thanks, as one of his readers, for his late valuable Extra on the Apostacy. That every allusion in it is infallibly correct, neither he nor we assert; but that it contains many valuable documents, interspersed with various judicious and excellent remarks, and that it cannot fail to be both edifying and interesting to every candid and inquisitive reader, we do not—we cannot doubt. The only misfortune which appears in this treatise,

Digitized by Google

is the position which the Printer has put the author of the Table on the 30th page. He has, by some singular mishap, made him the utmost twig on the Genevese branch of the Apostacy. I may add, that I have too much confidence in the good sense of the brethren in Virginia, and out of it, to say one word to them on their duties to a brother so disinterested, so highly gifted, so ardent, and so indefatigable in his labors in the gospel. ED. M. H.

Christian Baptist.

I HAVE just risen from a revisal of the CHRISTIAN BAPTIST. It is, indeed, the first time that I have ever read it regularly through. To this reading and revisal I have been invited by the spontaneous, and very generous proposals of our zealous, and indefatigable brother *Burnet*, to give to the public an improved (I might say an elegant and cheap) edition of this work. It is due to him, to the public, to the various contributors to the Christian Baptist, and perhaps to myself, that I should at this crisis of our history express my views of this work.

I will, then, inform the public, that in this reading I endeavored to make myself as much a stranger to its contents as I possibly could, to forget my own authorship and connexion with the undertaking, and to read it as if it were a new performance from some unknown person, lately imported into the country. I supposed myself at liberty to expunge every thing I did not like, and to differ from the author and contributors as much as I pleased, or could find reason to authorize.

I have, then, stricken from its pages only what might be properly called the *ephemeral* pieces, notices, and narratives of such incidents as related to matters and things temporary and transient, not affecting the permanent objects of the work, nor necessary to the illustration or defence of any of its cardinal principles. I had once thought of great improvements in its style, having been written in a free, conversational, familiar, and rather careless sort of style. But reading it in the manner above stated, I have concluded that I could not improve it—that it is just in the style which the occasion, the objects of the work, and the great mass of this community will best understand and most appreciate.

To polish it (were I ever so capable of it) would, in my judgment, rather be an injury than an advantage to its practical utility. Elegance of diction and the graces of rhetoric have rarely been the auxiliaries of heaven-born truth. I have sometimes thought that there is as much vanity, and perhaps as much pride, in the dress of the mind as of the body—in the display of language as in the display of personal beauty. Divine truth, and even good common sense,

> "Need not the foreign aid of ornament;
> But are, when unadorn'd, adorn'd the most."

With regard to the sentiment and the spirit of the work, I may say that I have not expunged a single sentiment—indeed, I have scarcely erased a single period, and consequently have not greatly improved the spirit of the work. I am, however, yet to be convinced that the spirit of the work needs much mending: It explains, justifies or reforms itself as the reader proceeds, and I have not learned the name of that reader who has carefully read the seven volumes to the end, that at last was not as well pleased with the *christian spirit* as with the *christian truth* in it. *He that approves or disapproves the one, approves or disapproves the other;* therefore, a change of spirit would be of no conceivable advantage to the work taken as a whole. I am willing, per-

Digitized by Google

fectly willing that the soul and body of the Christian Baptist should be co-existent; and, were it my last will and testament, I would bequeath to them an existence contemporaneously indissoluble. Once more, I am now better pleased with the work, *as a whole*, than ever before. All the principles of the reformation for which we have ever contended, are found in the first volume of it, and in the subsequent volumes they are examined, canvassed, and illustrated just as the exigencies of society required, or as the public mind could receive them.

I see there is a freshness and a vigor in this work, on all the topics of reformation, which cannot be transfused into any other since commenced upon the same subjects. They may be amplified, displayed, and ornamented according to the superior taste and talent of those who have since undertaken, or may hereafter undertake their illustration and defence. But neither the author of the Christian Baptist, nor its contributors can, in this community, ever impart a zest or flavor to these subjects superior to that, which, in the youthfulness and vigor of the themes and of their first efforts, they were able to impart to its various essays; at least, such is my judgment, and that is all which the occasion demands.

I need say nothing of the historical value of the Christian Baptist, as every one can appreciate that matter for himself; but being fully convinced that a more general reading of it would greatly advance the cause for which we plead, and anticipate innumerable difficulties, which, in the form of questions, are daily coming to us from all quarters—I cannot but express the conviction that it is incumbent on the friends of the restoration to extend its circulation as far as possible; and the hope that our much esteemed and beloved brother may be remunerated for this his freewill offering to the cause.

We have received a new Prospectus and a sample of the print, which is indeed very neat; from which we make the following extracts:—

"*Cincinnati*, December 26, 1834.

Dear Sir—The subjoined Prospectus is respectfully addressed to your attention. The value of the Christian Baptist cannot, at this time, be calculated, At a future period, when thousands shall call for it and inquiry shall be made for the principles found, elucidated, and sustained in it, a proper estimate will be made. Our other periodicals, which are all valuable, (and which these remarks are not intended to disparage,) are of a somewhat different character. The Christian Baptist, enjoying the correspondence, united wisdom and support of the whole reformation, ran a successful and brilliant course for seven years, and ceased only because the ends of its existence were accomplished; because the first principles of the whole scheme of faith and practice, for which we contend, were developed. These topics being thus stated, discussed, and defended, against the opposition of all who had courage or temerity to attack them, the "*Harbinger*" and its cotemporaries have taken a wider field and devoted themselves more to general intelligence, the state of the churches, &c. &c.

This edition is now in preparation at great cost, and we hope to be able to fill the first orders as early as April. By this very great expedition, we incur a proportionate expense, to defray which I rely upon the zeal and promptitude of the advocates of primitive christianity and religious liberty. Confident of the value of the work, and the intelligence and spirit of the brotherhood, I throw myself upon their protection, as their servant, at least in this revision and republication. I flatter myself, however, that corrected and abridged, by the rejection of some ephemeral matter, repetitions, &c. reduced to a convenient, durable, portable, and handsome form, it will recommend itself to all interested in the success of its sentiments, as very cheap, and worthy their patronage and a place in their library, for their own pleasure, and the profit of posterity. I hope you will be active in its circulation.

Yours for the truth's sake,

D. S. BURNET."

Digitized by Google

☞"Persons remote from navigation or places where the books will be sent in quantities, can inclose me four dollars (I paying the postage of the letter,) and the folded sheets will be sent them by mail; and as it is periodical, and contains but half as many sheets as the first edition, the postage on the work will be but half as great. The post-office here has been consulted."

PUBLISHING BY M'VAY AND EWING,

Christianity Restored;

Or, a Connected View of the Principles and Rules by which the Living Oracles may be intelligibly and certainly interpreted; of the Foundation on which all Christians may form One Communion; and of the Capital Positions sustained in the attempt to restore the Original Gospel and Order of Things; containing the principal Extras of the *Millennial Harbinger*, revised and corrected—By A. CAMPBELL.

Besides placing in a clear and impressive light the principles and rules of interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, so as to make the reader feel when he certainly understands what he reads, this work will exhibit a miniature view of all the great points contended for in the current reformation of morals, and the restoration of the ancient order of things—that the public mind may be disabused of much prejudice and erroneous representations, made by those too much interested in keeping up all the present discord and disunion in religious society. The evidence on which these principles rest—whether from revelation, or from the constitution of human nature and society—will be laid before the reader with all possible brevity; that he may be able to take a comprehensive view of the primitive institution of Jesus Christ, in contrast with the degeneracy of a sectarian age,—and that he may be fully convinced that there is but one scheme, rational and scriptural, for the uniting of all christians, and the harmonizing of all discords, as preparatory to the conversion of the world.

CONDITIONS.

1. This volume shall contain at least 372 pages, 12mo.
2. It shall be printed on a full, clear type, fine paper; and shall be neatly and substantially bound in good sheep; and handed to subscribers at One Dollar per volume.
3. Ten per cent. for cash payments on orders, not less than 10 copies; and a larger discount on larger orders, shall be allowed.
4. It is confidently expected that the work, at farthest, shall begin to be delivered to subscribers in the month of April next.

All orders addressed to the publishers, shall be attended to, if proper direction be given, in the order in which they are received.

This work, in the judgment of its author, the crisis demands. The original part of it will contain under the head of the Principles and Rules of Interpretation, the following chapters:—1. Written Revelation. 2. Authors of the Bible. 3. Inspiration of the Bible. 4. Language of the Bible. 5. Meaning of Words. 6. Literal Meaning of Words. 7. Figurative Meaning of Words. 8. Metaphor! 9. Allegory. 10. Metonymy. 11. Synecdoche, 12. Irony. 13. Hyperbole. 14. Catachresis. 15. Figure of Words. 16. Usage of Words. 17. Subject Matter. 18. Context. 19. Scope. 20. Analogy of Scripture. 21. Analogy of Faith. 22. Hieroglyphics. 23. Symbols. 24. Mystical Allegory. 25. Mystical Actions. 26. Types. 27. Parables. 28. Proverbs. 29. Emphasis. 30. Chapters, Verses, and Punctuation. 31. Three Dispensations. 32. Rules of Interpretation. This first part of the work is designed especially to edify all young and ardent proclaimers of the word, and all who aspire to be well instructed in the WONDERFUL BOOK of God. The second part for christians found in Babylon. The third for all mankind.

EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

THE CHURCH AT MOUNT VERNON, WOODFORD COUNTY, KENTUCKY.

IT will be remembered that in the 11th No. vol. 5, p. 573, 574, a letter was published from brother John Curd, near Mount Vernon, concerning the constitution of a new church in that place—twenty-five members of which had withdrawn from a congregation over which Dr. Fishback presided. The new church amounts to about 50 members. It was alleged that certain members had been cut off from the Baptist church for mere difference of opinion, amongst whom was our correspondent and the clerk of said church.

Since that time the party that adhere to Dr. Fishback's views of things, held a meeting and passed resolutions, a copy of which has been forwarded for publication, disapprobatory of those statements, and alleging other reasons for the exclusion of the aforesaid members. We had intended t publish the resolutions signed by *H. Wallace*, the present clerk of said congregation, a brother for whom we have always entertained a high regard; but since that time other documents have reached us, stating that all the members of said church did *not vote* for the resolutions and other matters which we plainly foresee would issue in a controversy wholly foreign to the design of our publication.

We have, therefore, concluded to publish none of the documents recently received, as the matter is now as fully and as fairly before the public as is necessary for its edification, and as it might be after a series of defences and rejoinders, &c. &c. Besides it can be better explained at home than abroad where the parties are all well known. EDITOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW YORK, January 4th, 1835.

Sir,—IN No. 10. vol. 5. you have commenced, and I hope you will follow up, a series of observations in relation to *Reformation*, which you have continued in No. 12. Sir, unless such important observations are regarded with full purpose of heart by those you address, great indeed will be the triumph of the adversary. The Lord Jesus denounced a woe on those who obeyed the law to the very letter, because they neglected justice and the love of God. What resemblance do you think exists between those who contend for obedience to the apostolic practice, and yet do not exhibit a love of justice and rigid regard to truth? We may deceive ourselves as to our loving God, by taking a limited view of what it means. But you, sir, know that love to God embraces "justice, humanity, and fidelity" towards our fellow-man. This is a wider space than we who glory in correct views of church order, are willing, (or at least by our conduct) to admit. With a view, sir, that you would 'cry aloud and spare not,' that you would show us Pharisees our sins, I would earnestly exhort you, sir, to follow up your demand, and require of all who name the name of Christ to depart from all iniquity—yea, the very appearance of it; and that we exhibit those fruits which are to the glory of God, as well to continue to render unfeigned obedience to all the laws of Christ's house, and that we should not think we are the people of God, unless we do the works of God; and never since the commencement of "the latter days" has the axe of infidelity been more earnestly applied

Digitized by Google

against the trees in the Lord's vineyard, than in the present day, to fell them, by exhibiting their evil deeds; for degenerate as the world is, the ungodly rarely bring a charge against the christian profession but on account of conduct contrary to what discipleship enjoins. I highly approve of your denouncing those who attempt to instruct, and call others to repent before they have the approval of their brethren, as being fitted for the work; as workmen who need not be ashamed—men who are 'apt to teach." All are to use the gifts God has given them, but the church is to judge, and woe to the church which judges unless in accordance with the word.

I hope, sir, you will pardon the freedom of my observations. I am one of your readers. J. B.

P. S. I would entreat your correspondent (Mr. Winans) to examine the Scriptures as to the true meaning of the phrase, "the last days"—I refer to his letter, p. 600, of No. 12. of the Harbinger. The only consistent view he will discover, in my opinion, is, that the phrase *last days* refers to the last revelation God would make to man, and that the gospel day is comprehended. Scoffers were to arise in the last days. In these last days God has spoken by his Son. Mr. Winans, confining the last days to the days of the Apostles, would countenance many other limitations; and his view appears to have been taken to support an awful and increasing error, that God does not now, as in the days of the Apostles, and as at all former periods, dispose the hearts of men to hear his voice, and obey his call. The opposition to the Spirit was a sin not to be forgiven, and yet there is more exertion of talent and subtilty of reasoning to oppose the influence and power of the Holy Spirit, (while the doing so is denying the power of God and exalting the creature, and that too by persons claiming superiority of attainments,) than is exhibited against any other doctrine set forth in the Holy Scriptures. I beg, sir, to observe that in the days of the Apostles the Spirit accompanied the word, and that too in the pointing out the Saviour at his baptism. The Spirit and the word were united on the day of Pentecost, at the house of Cornelius, in the convincing of Paul, the Eunuch, and others. Why did the fishermen leave their nets, Levi the seat of custom? Why did the chief captain attend to Paul's sister's son? O! sir, the Bible is full of the power of God upon the hearts of kings, rulers, even the wicked; yes, blessed be God, he has now, as of old, the hearts of all men in his hands. Dear sir, why do men labor to separate what God has joined, the word and the Spirit, unless to exalt poor worms of the earth, who may be born of the will of man or of the flesh; yet every disciple of Jesus is born from above. Spiritual life is as much the work of God as animal life. Sir, you are on a pinnacle. Satan desires to sift you and pull you down. You stand not on neutral ground. You will be a cause of glory to saints or devils; and those who seek the glory of God fear and stand aloof from you on *this very ground* which Mr. Winans seems to view with so much complacency, as if he had discovered something new. In separating the word from the Spirit, or in making the word the Spirit, though it is declared to be

Digitized by Google

"the sword of the Spirit." Perhaps I have mistaken him. O! how I shall rejoice, if so. If so, let him, without sophistry or reasoning, with perfect candor give his views. Hypocrisy in religion will occupy the lowest place of eternal vengeance. I ask him is the blessing of God to be invoked to give effect to the word in the present day—yes, or no? Where is the authority, I ask you, sir, for any new standard—for any new mean of conversion, for altering, amending, taking from, or adding to the Scriptures. No, no. God has in these last days spoken to us by his only Son, and the next revelation to earth will be when he will come attended by his angels, to render to every man according to his work.

[Some remarks on the above shall appear in our next.]——*Ed.*

Query.

CAN any man, consistently with his profession of a Christian, own or keep what is vulgarly termed in the West, a "Doggery"—a grocery of ardent spirits and wines, which he vends "wholesale and retail" to gratify, and minister to, the beastly appetite of the drunkard and dissipated? Does not such a man aid in promoting vice and dissipation? And is such an employment compatible with the real interests and high *honor* of the profession of the christian religion? And is it not the duty of christians to "turn away from such," and to exclude them from their fellowship and communion, if they do not desist after the necessary admonition? Please answer the above, in the Harbinger, as early as convenient; and give us your views of the cases in which christians are permitted to sell ardent spirits or wines. J. R. H.

I cannot understand how any person, enlightened in the New Testament, could voluntarily, and with a pure conscience, stand in such a "Doggery," or groggery, for one hour, much less officiate as a waiter from day to day on those miserable sinners who resort thither to drink down curses upon themselves and their houses. This would, indeed, resemble *making a living* by being porter at the gates of perdition.

I will not say that in no case a christian may sell strong drink; for if a christian may not sell, a christian may not buy ardent spirits; but how he can retail it out in the way of poison to soul and body, I cannot conceive. Besides, to live in the daily converse with those profane wretches (for tipplers are generally profane) who visit those haunts of bankruptcy and crime, appears to me a sort of anticipation of those horrid abodes of those foul spirits whose very presence would convert Eden itself into Tartarus. When I can with a good conscience break the sacred loaf with land or sea pirates, then, but not till then, can I have sweet communion with those who make their livelihood by helping men onward to perdition. *Editor.*

ERWINTON, Barnwell District, *S. C.* January 2, 1835.

Dear Sir—WE understand that there is a brother E. A. Smith, of Danville, Ky. who is laboring in the field of reformation. Will that dear brother come to our succor? May the Lord direct him to us! WM. R. ERWIN.

I feel it my duty to add, that, in my judgment, any brother qualified to contend for the ancient faith in the spirit and temper of that faith, would be amply rewarded for his labors in an abundant harvest of rich fruit should he bend his steps to the district of brother Erwin. If brother Smith cannot go, who will volunteer? Say, who?—*Editor.*

DEATH OF THE REV. EDWARD IRVING.

Died, December 6th, at Glasgow, between the hours of 11 and 12 o'clock at night, in the 43d year of his age, the Rev. *Edward Irving*. He was sensible to the last, and his departing words were, "*In life or in death I am the Lord's;*" previous to which he sung the 23d psalm in Hebrew, accompanied by his wife's father, the Rev. John Martin. [*Old Countryman.*]

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number III.——Volume VI.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. March, 1835.

Mistranslations---No. 2.

GIANTS.

"There were giants *in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown."*—Gen. vi. 4.

WE have no less than *seven* Hebrew words translated *giant* or *giants* in the King's version of the Old Testament. If then, indeed, one English word can fully render seven Hebrew words, truly we may be proud of our mother tongue. But if the Hebrews had seven words to express all that we express by the word *giant*, then where is the plea for the superior copiousness of our language, and the barrenness of that of the Jews? There is an error somewhere. We shall institute an examination of this matter.

The seven words rendered *giants* by James' translators, are, *emim*, *enachim*, *zamzuzim*, *rephaym*, *nephilim*, *gibborim*, and *rapha*.

Of these there are four or five which, beyond doubt, are what we call "proper names"—the names of persons and peoples. We read of the Emims, the Anachims, Zamzummims, or Zuzims, and the Rephaims. These were tribes of men, and not races of giants.

The Emims were cotemporaries with Moses, and dwelt in his time in the land of Moab, and existed even before the days of Chedorlaomer and Abraham. They were, together with the Zuzims and the Rephaims, vanquished by Chedorlaomer. (Gen. xiv. 5.) Here, then, are three of these tribes, or nations, mentioned together; for the Zuzims are called Zamzummims by the Amorites. (Deut. ii. 20.) Why not, then, have rendered Genesis xiv. 5. "And he smote the giants in Ashtaroth, and the giants in Ham, and the giants in Shaveh-kiriathaim"?

Digitized by Google

But the common version is not consistent with itself; for it sometimes renders some of these terms as common nouns, and anon as proper nouns—for example, 2 Samuel v. 18. "The Philistines spread themselves in the valley of Rephaim." We have this valley of Rephaim no less than six times—viz. 2 Samuel v. 18, 22. xxiii. 13. 1 Chron. xi. 15. xiv. 9. Isaiah xvii. 5. and the land of Rephaim once, Gen. xv. 18, 20. as a part of the promised land. Why, then, in the name of consistency, I ask, should they have translated it *giants* in Deuteronomy ii. 11. "The Emims dwelt there in times past, a people great and many, and tall as the Anakims, which also were accounted *giants* as the Anakims, but the Moabites call them Emims." It should have been, "The Emims had formerly dwelt there, a nation great and numerous, and mighty as the Anakims. They as well as the Anakims may be called (or accounted) Rephaims; but the Moabites call them Emims." This accords with all the knowledge we have of these freebooters; for as they dwelt in different countries, they no doubt received different names. But be this not conceded, still there is no reason for making a common noun of Rephaim in this place.

Again, (Deut. iii. 11.) Og king of Bashan remained of the remnant of giants—"of the remnant of *Rephaim*" both in the Hebrew and Septuagint. This displaces the word *giants* four times in the common version in reference to Og king of Bashan. See Deut. iii. 11, 13. Josh. xii. 4. xiii. 12. in all of which it is Rephaim.

Three times also we have *giants* when we should have *Rephaim;* for the same valley is spoken of, Joshua xv. 8. xvii. 15. and xviii. 16. which is six times spoken of as above quoted in the common version. This is the same valley which is called the valley of Hinnom; also, Gehenna, near Jerusalem. Why, then, should they have called it six times the valley of Rephaim, and three times the valley of giants!

Rapha is translated *giant* five times. It is always the name of a person whose sons were of extraordinary stature. This Rapha was a citizen of Gath. 2 Sam. xxi. 16, 18. 1 Chron. xx. 4, 6, 8.

But to return to Genesis vi. 4. In this verse we have the word *nephilim* translated *giants*, and the word *gibborim* translated *mighty men.* The former etymologically signifies *apostates*, being derived from *naphal*, "*he fell.*" Aquila renders *nephilim* by *epipiptontes*, "*those that rush with impetuosity on their enemies*"—*monsters, tyrants.* Symmachus also translates it *biaioi*, "*violent men.*" The Septuagint renders it by *gigantes*, from which the common version seems to have taken the word *giants.*

It were curious to trace the etymologies of the Greek words *gigantes* and *hagioi*, commonly rendered *giants* and *saints.* The former literally imports "*earthborns*"—the latter, "*persons separated from the earth.*" The giants, then, originally were those who were wholly earthly, sensual, and devilish; and it began to be appropriated to those persons of great earthly stature, some of which have been found amongst many nations. We have, therefore, much reason to dissent from the common version of Genesis vi. 4. The *nephilim* before the flood were violent men, tyrants, monsters, apostates, rather than per-

Digitized by Google

sons of gigantic stature. It is true the sons of Anak are once called *nephilim* because of their stature, but the context requires such a version of it. Num. xiii. 33. But the context, Gen. v i. 4. does not justify it, but constrains us to choose the *proper* rather than the *figurative* meaning of the word. This will be still more evident from an examination or the word *gibborim*, farther descriptive of them in the same verse.

Gibborim literally imports *warriors*, *conquerers*, from *gabar*, "he was victorious, he prevailed." Great warriors, conquerors, and devastators are properly called *gibborim*. The Septuagint sometimes translates this word by *gigantes*. Thus Nimrod is denominated "a *giant* before the Lord"—one of the *gibborim*. And in that version, Psalm xix. "The sun rises like a *giant* to run his race"—"The Lord will destroy the *giant* and the warlike man." Isai. iii. 2. "He will call his *giants*, in his wrath, to take vengeance on his enemies." Isai. xiii. 3. and in various other passages *gibborim* is translated by *gigantes* where warriors and conquerors is evidently intended.

That a few individuals of great stature have occasionally appeared, and that some races of men are of more than ordinary stature, is at once conceded; but that in the English Bible the word *giant* is most generally misapplied, I think must appear from the quotations already made. The verse before us, from all these premises, ought then to read, "Now there were *tyrants* in the earth in those days; and also after that the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bare them children, these became the heroes of old, the men of renown." This very naturally introduces the following verse: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great upon the earth."

These men of violence and crime are said to have been the fruit of the intermarriage between the sons of God and the daughters of men. There are no more flagrant sinners on earth than those who have had some little knowledge of God from one parent, and such a measure of atheism from the other as to extinguish every religious sentiment. Even such a smattering of religious knowledge as might be obtained from a parent who so dishonored his profession as to take an infidel wife, is necessary to give power to a youth to become gigantically wicked.

EDITOR.

Baptist Missionary Convention of New York.

THIRTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING.

THE Minutes of this meeting have been forwarded to us by some unknown person. It is said to be sustained by some 60,000 Baptists. It has voted $10,000 to the Baptist Home Mission Society. This said "Baptist Home Mission Society," in the second annual report of its executive committee, as quoted in the Minutes of the late Convention of October last, has the following sentence to stimulate the exertions of all Baptists to preach the gospel to the Americans:—"Here the Son of God is shorn of the glory of his divine honors—there

Digitized by Google

the efficacy of baptism is substituted for the merits of the atonement and the influence of the Holy Spirit." Now as we know of no persons who are charged with substituting the efficacy of baptism for the atonement and the influence of the Holy Spirit but our brethren, we must regard this as a direct accusation against us, uttered by the Baptist Home Mission Society, and sanctioned by the Missionary Convention of New York.

If Peter, by the Holy Spirit, imputed to all the Jews who heard him on Pentecost, the crime of having crucified the Lord of glory, because those whom they sustained by their countenance and suffrage had done so, may me not say that the whole denomination of Baptists connected with these inititutions have *falsely* accused us of a sentiment and practice most abhorrent to our souls. I can say for myself and for every man that I recognize as a christian brother, that I would as soon substitute the good works of Pope Urban for the sacrifice of Christ, as either faith, repentance, or baptism. "The efficacy of baptism," without the blood of Christ, and faith in that blood and repentance for sin, would be to my mind like the efficacy of a Jesuit's breath to turn a loaf into the Son of God. The New York Baptists have no pretext whatever for such a calumny. They cannot produce one word, in writing, from any teacher in the ranks of reformation, from Utica to New Orleans, that ever did assert such an idea.

And has it come to this that a whole society must invent the most palpable falsehoods and utter the most impudent calumnies to raise money to preach the gospel! Avaunt! you traders in indulgences of the Lutheran age! These dealers in new inventions can more than equal your ingenuity, and are full as daring against him who said, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." I cannot but hold every Baptist who patronizes the inventors and propagators of such a slanderous falsehood as a partaker in this sin—so long as I believe that Peter was justifiable in telling the Pentecostian Jews that they had by wicked hands crucified and slain the Messiah.

I call upon them, in the name of truth and righteousness, as they shall answer for it to the Judge of all, to repent of this wickedness, and to erase from their journals and their proceedings the guilt of this heinous offence against God and man. Let them only think how they would regard myself if I had published to the world that the Baptists of New York had substituted the efficacy of a tear, or of faith, for the merits of the atonement of Christ; and let them now do in reference to myself and brethren as they would wish us in such a case to do to them.

EDITOR.

Paul's Allusions to Ancient Customs.

NO. III.

IT is most astonishing to reflect on the shameful and abominable manner in which the Corinthians abused the Lord's Supper, by converting this sacred institution into one of those Club-repasts, which

Digitized by Google

were customary among the Greeks. I will lay before the reader, the unhappy state of the church of Corinth, with regard to the very disorderly manner in which they celebrated the Lord's Supper. The Apostle enters upon this subject, by telling them, 1 Epist. chap. xi. ver. 17. that their meeting together, was so far from advancing their mutual improvement, that it totally defeated the end of public worship; —for, says he, in the first place, when you are all convened in the church for the worship of God, I am informed, there are discords among you.—They quarrelled with one another, even in the very house of God. Instead of conducting public worship in a decent and devout manner, they poured forth the overflowings of a bad temper, and of their worst passions, one upon another. They had virulent altercation, and broke out into open contests and quarrels, even at the very table of the Lord.—Strange and amazing! that they should so soon forget the Apostle's directions about celebrating this ordinance, should pay so little attention to his example, and manner of solemnizing it, and should so soon lose the Christian temper and spirit; a spirit of love and charity, which this conciliating ordinanee above all others suggests and enforces.—But their reciprocal discords and quarrels, were not the only cause that constituted the unworthy manner of their celebrating the Lord's Supper. The Apostle farther tells them, That they assembled in the church of God to share a common repast, a common meal, and this they called EATING THE LORD'S SUPPER: turning the church of Christ into a banqueting, house, to sanctify inebriety, revel, and excess! Was there ever such a prostitution of the Lord's Supper! The Apostle gives a particular account how they did this. Every one of you carries with him his own supper, as was usual in their common collation-suppers, every one takes with him, from his own home, into the church, what provisions he likes best, and there eats his respective supper, separately, by himself: by which means, says he, the poor had a scanty, the rich a plentiful repast.——At this their licentious behaviour the Apostle inflamed with holy indignation, thus addresseth them: What! says he, have ye not houses to eat and drink in? Is it in this atrocious manner you prostitute the honor of the church of God, to make the house of prayer and praise, a public commodious room, in which to celebrate a banquet and revel? What shall I say unto you, do you merit my commendation for this?—you are unworthy of it!—The Apostle then tells them what was the consequence of these enormities in the Church of God, and at the very table of Jesus. This scandalous prostitution of the Lord's Supper, drew down upon them the divine inflictions; some of them were struck with instantaneous death, or with diseases; that terminated in death, others with sickness and indispositions; the great God, in this awful manner interposing, to put a stop to this shameful irreverence, to this intemperance and drunkenness at the Lord's table, and inflicting these chastisements to bring them to a sense of their wickedness, and recover them to their duty. He, therefore, that eateth and drinketh in this unworthy manner, by

Digitized by Google

perverting this institution into a revel, and the Church into a banqueting house, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself; brings down upon himself, by this intemperance and inebriety, the divine judgments and punishments, not discerning the Lord's body, not distinguishing the Lord's supper from a common convivial repast, a public, irregular, dissolute entertainment. Wherefore, says the Apostle, when you assemble to eat the Lord's Supper, do not celebrate it in this loose and licentious manner, but stay one for another—by which it appears that they violated all order and decency, some eating the provisions they had taken with them into the church long before others came in—and those who came in, sooner or later, sitting down separately from others, as was usual in their club-repasts, to partake of what they had respectively brought. And, therefore, the Apostle concludes with these words: If any of you should at the time feel the sensations of hunger, let him satisfy it at his own home, and not judge the church a place, in which voraciously to to eat, and intemperately to drink: lest, says he, you assemble for your own punishment. Hence it appears that the Corinthian Christians regarded the Lord's Supper in the light of their common *cænæ collatitiæ*, or club-repasts, which were very customary among the Greeks, and to which every guest carried with him his own supper. The following passages from Xenophon and Athenæus excellently illustrate this passage of Scripture. "When of those, says Xenophon, who met to sup, some of the company had brought with them a very little, others a great deal of provisions, Socrates bade the servant either to put the little in common, or distribute to each a part of it. Upon which, those, who had brought a plentiful repast with them, were both ashamed not to partake of what was served up in common, and not also to produce their own. They, therefore, put down their provisions in common, and when they enjoyed no more than those who had brought but little, they desisted from expending much in buying victuals." We learn from Athenæus, that these club entertainments among the Greeks, into which the Corinthians had debased the Lord's Supper, were called Basket-suppers, from the vehicle in which they were carried. "The ancients, says he, were acquainted with what we now call basket-suppers. Pherecrates makes express mention of them in the following passage: "When he had put his supper into a basket, he repaired to the house of Ophele." These words manifestly indicate what we now style the basket supper, when a person after having provided his own supper, puts it into a basket and repairs to another's house to eat it." H

The Millennium---No. 7.

WERE I to attempt a full display of the Apostacy—to place it in all the attitudes, to clothe it with all the imagery, to exhibit it under all the symbols of Daniel and John—your patience, Mr. Editor, and that of your readers would, I fear, be taxed beyond endurance. A

Digitized by Google

sketch, a miniatare sketch, is all that I intended; and such a sketch as would be subservient to the point of debate between myself and the literalists. To resume the subject, and to state the point, *the capital point*, as you would call it, to which all my reasonings tend —

It is agreed on both sides that the Apostacy, or *the Man of Sin branch of the Apostacy*, is finally to be utterly destroyed by *the brightness of the coming of the Lord*. But whether this *coming* is *personal* and *literal*, or only *figurative*, is the point at issue. I am decidedly of opinion—nay, I believe, I had almost said, that the Man of Sin, the little horn, the false Prophet will be destroyed not by the Lord *in person*, but by such a display of the sword of his mouth, and of the strength of his right arm—*by his word and by his judgments*, as may, in perfect conformity with the sacred style, with the prophetic symbols, with the bold and splendid metaphors of prophecy, be called *the brightness of his coming*.

I would proceed forthwith to demonstrate from the fates declared of old, from what is written of the fortunes of all the symbols employed to depict his rise, progress, and ruin, that the Lord himself will not appear in the field of battle; but from heaven shall give orders to his Captains, and pour down destruction on his foes: but in arranging the materials for this *exposition* I discover that it is farther prerequisite to notice the symbols of the *two-horned beast* and of the *mystical city*. This I do to brighten the evidence already offered and to confirm the conclusions immediately to be deduced.

The Apostacy has been considered under the figure of *the Man of Sin*, under the figure of the *little horn*, and partially under the figure of the *healed head*. I am duly apprised that to understand how, or in what respect it can be contemplated under this last figure, the *two-horned beast* ought to be regarded in the light of the vision and prophecy. Before, then, we shall sum up the evidence in proof of our position, we shall offer a remark or two upon the "two-horned beast" and the "mystical city."

Pagan Rome, in all its various forms of government, was always the same *beast*. Its *heads*, indeed, were different, but its *body* and its *spirit* were still the same. Diverse, however, as were its *seven heads*, *blasphemy* was legibly inscribed upon each of them. All the forms of government, whether that of kings, consuls, dictators, decemvirs, military tribunes with consular authority, imperial, or semi-imperial, were essentially idolatrous. And its eighth head, which is *of the seven* and is *the eighth*—another and the same—is as blasphemous against Christ as its former heads were against God.

Five heads were fallen before the days of John. Under the sixth it appears in the years of the Messiah. Then, indeed, under an imperial head it stood forth in terrific grandeur against the Heir of the Universe. But yet, while under the same head, and under the dynasty of the Cesars, in the lapse of less than three centuries it politically paid homage to the Cross. But the imperial glory from that time began to fade; and finally, from the imperial it soon passed into the *semi-imperial* form. This was its *seventh* head, and this is

Digitized by Google

that head which from the ruthless hands of the barbarous nations of the North received a mortal wound in the person of Augustulus. The *beast*, however, still lived; and, strange to tell, the deadly wounded head was healed.

Divided into ten kingdoms for a time, it continued without any general head. And had not its conquerors embraced the Christian faith, in all probability the wounded head would never have been healed. But here a new scene in the great drama of human history is presented to our view. Within the bowels of the old empire a new empire, an *imperium in imperio*, begins to form. It is now that John sees *the earth* bring forth a beast having *two horns like a lamb*, yet speaking like a dragon! Soon he assumed and exercised all the power of the first beast—the old Latin Empire, now clothed with TEN horns. He commanded an IMAGE of the first beast (yet alive) to be made,* and soon as the image was formed he gave it *breath*, and caused the whole earth to worship this image of the beast, and kill those that would not.†

Need I say that it is not in the art of painting, nor in the power of the pencil to present a better likeness of the Man of Sin than we have in the picture now before us. So striking is the likeness that Popes themselves and persecuting Prelates have been abashed in its presence, while seeking to brand in the forehead and in the palms of the hand the sons of their stately hierarchies.

A two-horned lamb-like beast speaking like a dragon! What a monster! Who cannot see in this the priesthood making to themselves a head—a Pope—a Vicar of the Lamb—and clothing it with secular and spiritual powers. Is not this the eighth head—one of the seven, and yet the eighth! whose titles are not CESAR THE EMPEROR AND HIGH PRIEST OF ROME, but His Holiness the King of Kings, and the pretended Vicar of the High Priest in heaven. But "he goes to destruction;" and for our purpose one remark is enough: It is by this *false teacher*, by *this image* of the dragon, this *healed head*, that the *ten kings* concentrate their powers, and display that authority lost in the person of Augustulus.

But the Apostacy is presented under the figure of a woman and a city. A woman, indeed, is one of the most common and the most apposite symbols of a city, a state, a church; and a city itself is some times the symbol of a corporation—of a hierarchy. Hence in the sacred style ancient Babylon of Chaldea is made the picture of that corrupt hierarchy sometimes called Papal Rome. A woman splendidly arrayed, clothed *cap-a-pie*, with names of blasphemy, having in her hand a golden goblet filled with abominations, and seated on a crimson-colored beast, at one time suddenly arrested the admiration of the Prophet. She approached so closely to his vision that he read

* The Pope undoubtedly—a fac simile of the *imperator et pontifex maximus* of the Augustan Latin Empire.

† The secular and spiritual Priesthood—the kingdom of the clergy—this new Latin church in the old Latin church of Cesar, unquestionably is imaged out in this *lamb-like two-horned beast*.

Digitized by Google

upon her forehead her letters of recommendation—"MYSTERY, *Babylon the Great, the* MOTHER *of* HARLOTS *and abominations of the earth.*" Drunken with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus, the best human blood that ever stained the earth, she was able to keep the saddle only by the *ten horns* which sustained her. The angel of the revelation kindly relieved the Prophet by informing him, "The woman whom thou sawest is that great city that reigns over the kings of the earth." This is the mystical city, the fountain of authority to all the kings of the Western Empire.

Having now no debate upon the symbols before us, we hasten to show that the intimations of the spirit of prophecy concerning the final destruction of the antichristian faction, do not authorize the expectation of the personal appearance of the Messiah under whatever symbol or figure we are taught to contemplate the rise, progress, or overthrow of this idolatrous and blasphemous hierarchy, with all its dependencies.

In all the prophecies and under all the symbols which prefigure and portray this appalling defection, its rise and final overthrow are represented as *gradual* and progressive. It did not, like an angel, instantaneously appear; nor will it, like an angel, suddenly depart. It was an embryo, an infant, a child, a strippling, a youth, an adult, a full grown man of sin, and is now an old man well stricken in years. All the Prophets and all their imagery thus represent it. But they all agree that it cannot die in peace "All that take the sword shall perish with the sword;" and whatever other oracles and prophecies may add to her doom, whatever other calamities the God of heaven may inflict upon her, this prediction of the great Prophet shall certainly not fall to the ground; and if she have to receive from the hand of the Lord double for all her sins, what crimson currents shall yet flow through all the streets and alleys of this ill-fated city! That sword which once suspended hung over Jerusalem, now hangs over that great city—great in crime, and drunken with the blood of millions of martyrs—and when bathed in her heavens her fountains and streams shall be converted into rivers of blood.

"Rome," says the proverb, "was not built in one day;" and, in one day she cannot be expected to be destroyed. True, indeed, she will have her last day as she had her first day, and the day of her fall shall be a day signally marked with the vengeance of insulted Heaven—a day long to be remembered—a day of awful grandeur and eternal fame. But before that great and dreadful day of the Lord arrives, she will have been long in the furnace, and shall have suffered a thousand deaths in dreading one. A grievous consumption from the Lord shall fall upon her, and before the agonies of death shall have seized her she shall be a wonder to herself and a wonder to the whole world.

To this the words and symbols of all the Prophets agree. The *little horn* under which Daniel ushered this apostacy to our view, loses its dominion, *gradatim*—"The judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to *consume* and to *destroy* it *to the end.*"*

**Daniel* vii. 27.

Digitized by Google

His dominions it appears shall by degrees waste away, until his destruction, complete and perfect, shall arrive. The saints, however, do not receive "the kingdom and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven" till this *little horn* shall have been utterly destroyed.

Again, the Apostacy reviewed under the figure of *the Man of Sin*, has a similar doom assigned it. "The Lord," says Paul, "will consume him by the breath of his mouth,* and shall utterly destroy him by the brightness of his coming."†

But it is to the Apocalypse, which treats of this personage under so many figures, we must look for the fullest displays of light on his character, and for the details of his catastrophe. And it ought to be noticed, that after John has introduced and depicted this defection, and caused it to pass before us in all its characteristic attributes, he leads us forward to its doom by an imagery, which, while it most definitively arrays before us the enormity of its character, most impressibly admonishes us of a long series of means, which, in a regular succession, are to waste and consume his dominion before the final blow is stricken.

Instead of descanting upon the fates of the *dragon*, the *beast*, the *image of the beast*, the *false Prophet*, we should take the most comprehensive symbol, not only because the Prophet is more ample in his details of its final doom; but because its fate includes that of the others so far as they relate to the subject before us.

The reader will please remember that the seven *last* plagues are now to occupy our attention. "*In them*," testifies the Spirit, "*the wrath of God was to be completed.*" Seven angels, not one destroying angel, but *seven* angels, soon as the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony was opened in heaven, present themselves to the view of the Prophet. They appear in celestial habiliments of snowy white, girded round the breasts with golden girdles. One of the heavenly hierarchs near the throne hands to each of them a golden cup *full of the wrath of God.* The temple was full of smoke filled with the glory of God, and no soul could enter it till they had poured out their cups of wrath upon the devoted apostates. A voice full of awful majesty from within the temple commands them to pour out their portions of wrath upon the earth. They all received their order at the same time, but in succession they present themselves.

Now, even now, after the sharp two-edged sword had long been wasting the dominions and the strength of the ten-horned beast and the two-horned beast, the work of vengeance is not instantaneous.

---

† "By his speech in the Scriptures."—Macknight in loco.

‡ The word *analosei*, translated *consume*, Chandler says is used to denote a lingering consumption, and is applied to the waste of time—to the dissipation of an estate—to the slow death of being eatun up by worms. Of consumption by the breath of his mouth, it may be noticed that his Word is called the Sword that proceedeth out of his mouth. Rev. i. 16. Heb. iv. 12. "I have hewn them by my Prophets. I have slain them by the word of my mouth. Hosea vi. 5. Isai. xi. 4.

Digitized by Google

One angel pours out his portion of fury upon the earth, and makes a solemn pause. Another succeeds, and placing himself over the ocean, drains out his vengeance upon the world of waters, on which the woman sat. A third seeks for the fountains and streams of water, and pouring upon them his cup full of wrath, they are converted into blood. A fourth ascends above the sun, and inflames the luminary of the system. A fifth seeks out *the throne* of the beast, and visits it with a dire calamity. A sixth flies beyond the limits of the Western Empire, and standing over the river where Daniel and the captives of Judah wept, he pours his cup upon the Euphrates, and its waters are dried up. And while men, yet obdurate and impenitent, are cursing the God of heaven, the seventh angel scatters his vengeance upon the very heavens over them, extinguishes sun, moon, and stars, and fills the air with death. And what then ensues? Voices, thunders, lightnings, an earthquake unparalleled before, and a voice from the temple, crying, *It is done!* The great city falls into three pieces. The cities of the Gentiles are one heap of ruins. Babylon, with all her blood-guilty deeds, is remembered by God; she is made to drink the cup of the bitter wine of his fiercest wrath. Every island disappears—the mountains are no more—from heaven falls a great hail, every stone a talent weight.——*Yet men blaspheme God on account of the hail!!?*—a convincing proof that even in the days of the last plague the Lord appears not in person: for can any one think that even his presence in this awful crisis fails to suppress this blasphemy and to subdue men to repentance!

Now an angel of superlative splendor and glory from heaven descends, and crying aloud with a mighty voice full of majesty, reaching from East to West, announces her ruin complete—"It is fallen! It is fallen! Even Babylon the Great!" From heaven a voice commands, "Come out from her, O my people! partake not of her sins nor of her plagues." But how shall we explain what follows? The kings of the earth, the merchants, the artificers, the sea captains, the mariners, and even sailors themselves, in this awful crisis raise a lugubrious lamentation, and in plaintive strains bewail her fall.

It would seem, then, that princes and kings, with all their lusts and passions; that merchants, traders, and all craftsmen, full of the spirit of the world, survive her desolation and bitterly lament her fearful fall and destruction. If, then, the Lord by *the brightness of his coming* has thus destroyed the Man of Sin and completed his ruin, may we not confidently say it was not by his personal presence, seeing such a state of things would be impossible on such a hypothesis?

But yet another proof remains, and stronger still, and with that we shall finish this part of our subject. It will certainly be conceded that *the harlot* herself represents the whole apostacy from Christ—the whole corrupt church. As clearly, pertinently, and forcibly as a chaste virgin is the symbol of the bride, the Lamb's wife, the true apostolic church; so clearly, appositely, and forcibly does a harlot represent the unholy thing, now called the Church in France, in Spain, in Portugal, in Italy, &c. &c. debauched by the kings of the earth.

Digitized by Google

This harlot has so long sat upon the symbolic waters as to obtain for her the title of "*the Water Nymph*;" but these waters the Prophet explains to be people, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.

To draw near to the point at which we aim—the ten horns—the ten kings which grew out of these waters—these peoples, nations, and languages, which so long sustainnd the harlot and lived deliciously with her, shall, at last, grow tired of their mistress and actually hate her with a perfect hatred. In the same figurative style God shall put it into their hearts to "*execute his judgment*" upon this very harlot to whom they had given up their kingdoms so long. They will first "*strip her naked and make her desolate*;" put her out of their protection;—in the next place they will "*eat her flesh*;" and, last of all, they will "*burn her with fire*." This is her doom; for so it is written. Rev. xvii. 15—17.

The three metaphors of making her desolate—eating her flesh—and burning her with fire, are very easily understood. To make her *desolate and naked* is, in prophetic language, to cause her false worship to be abandoned and to expose her to disgrace—to *eat her flesh* is certainly to devour her riches, to sequester all her enormous possessions, and to appropriate them to the supplies of political society; and to *burn her with fire*, the established symbol of utter destruction—is to destroy her utterly. Therefore, no words or phrases in the vocabulary of prophetic iconisms are more certainly fixed and definite in their meaning than these three before us. To *eat flesh*, even in the prophecies, is not always a symbol; but wherever it is a symbol, this is certainly its meaning. In this passage it certainly is a figure, and must be understood as above.

Now is it not evident as any prophetic oracle in all prophecy, that the kings or kingdoms which sustained the Apostacy, will be God's angels to destroy it forever? That God's *earthly* ministers will execute his judgment upon the corrupt church, and destroy it root and branch, is as clearly asserted as that it shall be destroyed. And if so, then does not *the coming of the Lord* to destroy the Man of Sin, or the Mother of Harlots, or Babylon the Great, or the Beast, or the false Prophet, or to root up the Little Horn—I say, does not this phrase necessarily import not a personal and supernatural display of the Messiah; but such a manifestation of his power, purpose, and character as to make it *evident that it is the hand of the Lord* which inflicted the judgment, and that it is no mere accident or contingency, but a certain and irresistible demonstration of the truth of peophecy, and of the supremacy of Jesus as King of Kings and Lord of Lords?

May I not now say, with all the premises in view, that it is proved that the literalists are in error—mistaken, so far at least, as respects the *personal* appearance of the Messiah to destroy or put down the present forms of government, political and ecclesiastical—to destroy the Man of Sin, and to usher in the Millennium, or a new and better state of society? To the judgment and intelligence of the reader I make my appeal.

Here I would lay down my pen and await the response and decision

Digitized by Google

of our friend M'Corkle, or any other literalist from Maine to Georgia, were it not to complete this my first chapter that it is necessary to attend to a seeming discrepancy in the Apocalypse, which must strike the atteation of the reader: for while kings in the 17th chapter are introduced as hating and destroying the Harlot of Babylon, in the following chapter they are introduced as lamenting her ruin. To examine this matter a little may illustrate some things too hastily passed in the rapidity of my progress to the point now demonstrated, and may direct the mind of some of your readers in deciding what events are first to be expected in the religious and political conditions of society according to the intimations of the vision and prophecy.

A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

To Mr. William Jones, of London.

Letter IV.

My much esteemed and venerable brother Jones,

YOU wish me to state whether we of the reformation in America, differ from our brethren in England in any articles of the christian faith and practice; and if we differ from you in any thing, to state wherein.

I trust that before this reaches you, the works forwarded you will have arrived in England; and from these you will more fully learn, than I can now write, our views of the ancient and the modern exhibitions of christianity. There is, in our judgment, a great difference between original christianity and the best modern forms of it, with which we are acquainted. But that I may be understood on the question before us, I will preface my reply with a few remarks on the cardinal difference between the original institution of Jesus Christ and the reformed religions of Protestant countries.

If I were to classify in *three* chapters the whole christian institution, after the fashion of the modern schools, for the sake of being understood, I would designate them christian *faith*, christian *worship*, and christian *morality*. To these the moderns have added two others, which, using the same licence, I would call human *philosophy*, and human *traditions*. Now, in the first chapter, we, and all christians, are agreed: for as christian faith has respect to the *matters of fact* recorded—to the direct testimony of God found in the New Testament concerning himself—concerning his Son and Spirit—concerning mankind—what he has done, what we have done, and what he will do, there is no debate. I find all *confessions of* FAITH, properly so called, like the *four* gospels, tell the same story so far as matters of fact or faith are concerned.

In the second chapter we are also agreed that God is to be worshipped through the Mediator—in prayer, in praise, public and private—in the ordinances of christian baptism, the Lord's day, the

Digitized by Google

Lord's supper, and in the devotional study of his word and of his works of creation and providence.

In the third chapter we all acknowledge the same moral code. What is morality is confessed and acknowledged by all; but in the practice of it there are great subtractions.

We repudiate the two remaining chapters as having any place in our faith, worship, or morality; because we think that we have discovered that all the divisions in Protestant christendom—that all the partyism, vain jangling, and heresies which have disgraced the christian profession, have emanated from human philosophy and human tradition. It is not faith, nor piety, nor morality; but philosophy and tradition that have alienated and estranged christians, and prevented the conversion of the world. Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle deserved not the reputation of philosophers, if Calvin, Arminius, and Wesley were not worthy of it. The former philosophised morally on nature and ancient tradition—the latter, on the Bible and human society.

Religious philosophers on the Bible have excogitated the following doctrines and philosophical distinctions:—

'The Holy Trinity;' 'Three persons of one substance, power, and eternity;' 'Co-essential, consubstantial, co-equal;' 'The Son eternally begotten of the Father;' 'An eternal Son;' 'humanity and divinity of Christ;' 'The Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son;' 'God's eternal decrees;' 'Conditional and unconditional election and reprobation;' 'God out of Christ;' 'Free will;' 'Liberty and necessity;' 'Original sin;' 'Total depravity;' 'Covenant of grace;'* 'Effectual calling;' 'Free grace;' 'Sovereign grace;' 'General atonement;' 'Particular atonement;' 'Satisfy divine justice;' 'Reconciled God;' 'Active and passive obedience of Christ;' 'Common and special operations of the Holy Ghost;' 'Imputed righteousness;' 'Inherent righteousness;' 'Progressive sanctification;' 'Justifying and saving faith;' 'Historic and temporary faith;' 'The direct and reflex acts of faith;' 'The faith of assurance, and the assurance of faith;' 'Legal repentance;' 'Evangelical repentance;' 'Perseverance of the saints,'* and 'Falling from grace;'* 'Visible and invisible church;' 'infant membership;' 'Sacraments;' 'Eucharist;' 'Consubstantiation;' 'Church government;' 'The power of the keys,' &c. &c. &c.

Concerning these and all such doctrines, and all the speculations and phraseology to which they have given rise, we have the privilege neither to affirm nor deny—neither to believe nor doubt; because God has not proposed them to us in his word, and there is no command to believe them. If they are deduced from the Scriptures, we have them in the facts and declarations of God's Spirit; if they are not deduced from the Bible, we are free from all the difficulties and strifes which they have engendered and created.

We choose to speak of Bible things in Bible words, because we are always suspicious that if the word is not in the Bible, the idea which

* These are examples of scriptural phrases misapplied: for the corruption of christianity has been consummated by the incursions of barbarian language, and by the new appropriations of the sacred style.

Digitized by Google

it represents is not there; and always confident that the things taught by God are better taught in the words, and under the names, which the Holy Spirit has chosen and appropriated, than in the words which man's wisdom teaches.

There is nothing more essential to the union of the disciples of Christ than *purity* of speech. So long as the earth was of one speech, the human family was united. Had they been then of a pure speech as well as of one speech, they would not have been separated. God, in his just indignation, dispersed them; but before he scattered them *he divided their language*. One of his Prophets, who lived in a degenerate age, who prophesied against the corruptions of his day, when he spoke of better times, of an age of union and communion, was commanded to say in the name of the Lord, "Then will I turn to the people a *pure language*, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him *with one consent*."* Purity of speech is here declared to be prerequisite to serving the Lord with one consent.

"The words of the Lord are pure words."† To have a pure speech we must choose the language of Canaan, and abandon that of Ashdod. And if we would be of one mind, we must "speak the same thing." This was Paul's scheme of union, and no man can suggest a better.

It requires but little reflection to discover that the fiercest disputes about religion are about what the Bible does *not* say, rather than about what it *does* say—about words and phrases coined in the mint of speculative theology. Of these the *homousios* and the *homoousios* of the ever-memorable Council of Nice are a fair sample. Men are neither wiser, more intelligent, nor better, after, than before, they know the meaning of these words. As far as known on earth, there is not in "the Book of Life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," the name of any person who was either converted or sanctified to God by any of these controversies about human dogmas, nor by any thing learned from the canons or creeds of all the Councils, from that of Nice to the last Methodistic Conference.

It is a virtue, then, to forget this scholastic jargon, and even the names of the dogmas which have convulsed christendom. It is a concession due to the crisis in which we live, for the sake of peace, to adopt the vocabulary of Heaven, and to return the borrowed nomenclature of the schools to its rightful owners—to speculate no more upon the opinions of Saint Austin, Saint Tertullian, Saint Origen—to speak of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit—of the gospel, of faith, of repentance, of baptism, of election, of the death of Christ, of his mediation, of his blood, of the reconciliation, of the Lord's supper, of the atonement, of the church of God, &c. &c., in all the phrases found in the Record, without any partiality—to learn to love one another as much when we differ in opinion as when we agree, and to distinguish between the testimony of God and man's reasonings and philosophy upon it.

The Apostle says, "There is one body, one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one immersion, one God and Father of all." But no

* *Zephaniah* iii. 9. † *Psalm* xii. 6.

Digitized by Google

where is it said in the sacred book, *There is one opinion.* If, however, unity of opinion were desirable, to attain it, we must give the greatest liberty of opinion; for though once theory with us, it is now matter of experience, that the more stress is laid upon unity of opinion, the less of it, and the more division; and the less regard paid to it, the less emphasis laid upon it, the more we will have of it. This is founded in a law of the human mind, on which it is unseasonable and unnecessary to expatiate.

We have good reason to say, that there exists not the same number of professors in any department of christendom amongst whom unity of opinion as much as unity of faith is the bond of union, so much of one opinion in all matters pertaining to the christian institution, as amongst the brethren who have agreed cordially "to receive one another without regard to differences of opinion." They have not laid so much stress upon it, and therefore they have the more of it.

Amongst christians there is now, as there was at the beginning, a very great diversity in the knowledge of the christian institution. There are babes, children, young men, and fathers in Christ now, as well as in the days of the Apostle John. This, from the natural gifts of God, from the diversities of age, education, and circumstances, is unavoidable. And would it not be just as rational and as scriptural to excommunicate one another, because our knowledge is less or greater than any fixed measure, as for differences of opinion or matters of speculation?

Indeed, in most cases where proscription and exclusions now occur in this country, the excluded are the most intelligent members of the society; and although no community will accuse a man because he knows more of his Bible than his brethren, and on this account exclude him from their communion; yet this, it is manifest, rather than heresy, (of which, however, for consistency's sake, he must be accused,) is, in truth, the real cause of separation.

If God has bestowed better gifts or better opportunities on one man than on another, by which he has attained more knowledge, instead of thanking God for his kindness to the community, they beg God to take him away; and if he will not be so unkind, they will at length put him from among them under the charge of heresy. In most instances the greatest error of which a brother can be guilty, is to study his Bible more than his companions—or, at least, to surpass them in his knowledge of the mystery of Christ.

I need not say much upon the chapter of *human traditions.* They are easily distinguished from the *Apostles' traditions.* Those of the Apostles are found in their writings, as those of men are found in their own books. Some human traditions may have a show of wisdom, but it is only an appearance. So long as it is written, "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," so long will it be presumptuous folly to add the commandments of men to the precepts of Jesus Christ. I know of but one way in which all the believers in Jesus Christ, honorably to themselves, honorably to the Lord, and advantageously to all the sons of Adam, can form one

Digitized by Google

communion. All have two chapters too many in their present ecclesiastic constitutions. The contents of the aforesaid two chapters are various and different in all the sects, but they all have two chapters of the same name. In some they are long, and in some they are short; but whether long or short, let every one agree to tear them out of his book and burn them, and be satisfied with *faith*, *piety*, and *morality*. Let human philosophy and human tradition, as any part of the christian institution, be thrown overboard into the sea, and then the ship of the church will make a prosperous, safe, and happy voyage across the ocean of time, and finally, under the triumphant flag of Immanuel, gain a safe anchorage in the haven of eternal rest.

I would appeal to every honorable, good, and loyal citizen of the kingdom of heaven—to every one that seeks the good of Zion, that loves the kingdom and the appearing of our common Lord and Saviour, whether such a concession be not due to the Lord, to the saints in heaven and on earth, and to the whole human race in the crisis in which we are now placed; and whether we could propose less, or ought to demand more, than to make one whole burnt offering of all our "empty and deceitful philosophy"—our "science, falsely so called"—and our traditions received from our fathers. I would leave it to the good sense of every sane mind to say, whether such a whole burnt offering would not be the most acceptable peace offering, which, in this our day, could be presented on the altar of the Prince of Peace; and whether, under the teaching of the Apostles of the Great Prophet, the church might not again triumphantly stand upon the holy ground which she so honorably occupied before Origen, Austin, Athanasius, or the first Pope was born!

My dear sir, after this exposition you will no doubt perceive that it is a cardinal feature in the reformation for which we contend, to displace all the scholastic doctrines, phrases, terms of the "primitive fathers" and "the Protestant reformers," and to contend earnestly for the faith formerly delivered to the saints. I may add, that as far as I am informed of the faith, piety, and morality of the brethren in England, we are one with them; and even in matters of opinion, I opine there is a very general concurrence between them and us. We may have some philosophy and some traditions which we ought not to have, and you may unfortunately be in the same predicament; but so long as neither of us make these a bond of union, nor a term of communion, we can cheerfully and happily maintain unity of spirit by the strong bonds of the christian peace. We no doubt necessarily differ in the extent of our knowledge of the whole revelation of God; but should you be more intelligent in the sacred Scriptures than we, we will thank you to teach us the way of the Lord more perfectly, and we will thank God for your assistance. We trust that we have been taught that if our brethren are more gifted than we, or have improved their opportunities better than we, they are not on that account heretics, and to be treated as heathen men and publicans.

Touching all private matters in your letter, I will, so soon as I have

Digitized by Google

read the books you have so kindly forwarded to me, (not yet, however, come to hand,) write you more particularly.

May favor, mercy, and peace be multiplied to you, and all the holy brethren with you, from God our Father, and Jesus Christ our Lord: to whom be glory now and forever!

In the hope of immortality, yours,

EDITOR.

The Jesuit's Oath.

WERE I to be asked what is the darkest and most ominous cloud in our national heavens, unhesitatingly I would answer, 'Slavery as now established by law.' Again, were I asked for the next most inauspicious and portentous cloud in our political horizon, I must, with equal promptitude, reply, 'The rapid growth of a *popish empire* in the bosom of the Republic.'

There is no proposition out of the Bible—no conclusion resulting from political and ecclesiastic history—from the present science of human nature and human society—and above all, from the workings of corrupt religion—to which I can yield a more immediate and unhesitating assent than to the following.

Popery is naturally, necessarily, and essentially despotic, cruel, and implacable. It constitutionally claims a sovereignty over not only the secular sword, but over every thing on earth—thought, language, action, spirit, soul, body, and estate. It regards itself as the heir of all earthly things, and by a right divine and irrevocable, the only earthly King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Its motto is, 'The empire of the globe, or nothing.' The law of gravity will cease to act sooner than this superstition sleep on this side of absolute dominion.

It cannot be a *guest* in any land—it must be the *host*. It claims to be *the church*, the only church in which there is salvation; and that as Jesus Christ is in heaven head over all things for the church, so his Vicar of Rome is to be *jure divino* the head over all earthly things for the sake of the church in which alone salvation can be found. It cannot be cured—man cannot wash the Ethiopian white, nor change the leopard's spotted skin. While Popery lives it must reign. It is the soul, the very life of the system; and take away from it these attributes, and nothing remains.

I speak of *the system* of Popery, and not of every individual Catholic in his private capacity. Occasionally the man triumphs over the system; but neither the politician nor the philosopher builds a system upon exceptions. A thousand good, quiet, peaceable Catholic citizens in a million is no great acquisition to any government. It is not the people generally, but the priesthood that is confederated under the Pope against the liberties of the world. It is the officers of the troops that direct the chariots of war. The following oath of allegiance of the officers of the staff of His Holiness, shows what may be expected, and how a serpent is now cherished in our bosoms which may yet sting us to death:—

Digitized by Google

Oath of secrecy devised by the Roman Clergy, as it remained on record in Paris, among the Society of Jesus.

I., A. B., now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michael, the archangel, the blessed St. John Baptist, the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and the saints and sacred hosts of heaven, and to you my ghostly father, do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that his holiness Pope Urban is Christ's vicar general, and is the true and only head of the catholic or universal Church throughout the earth; and that by virtue of the keys of binding and loosing given to his holiness by my Saviour Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, *states, commonwealths*, and governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation, and that they may safely be destroyed. Therefore, to the utmost of my power I shall and will defend this doctrine, and his holiness' rights and customs against all usurpers of the heretical (or Protestant) authority; especially against the now pretended authority and Church of England, and all adherents, in regard that they and she be usurpal and heretical, opposing the sacred mother Church of Rome. I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince, or *state*, named Protestants, or *obedience* to any of their inferior *magistrates or officers*. I do further declare the doctrine of the Church of England, of the Calvinists, Huguenots, and of other of the name Protestants, to be damnable, and they themselves are damned, and to be damned, that will not forsake the same. I do further declare that I will help, assist, and advise all or any of his holiness' agents in any place, wherever I shall be, in Ireland, England, and Scotland, or in any other territory or kingdom I shall come to, and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical *Protestants' doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended powers, regal and otherwise. I do* farther promise and declare, that notwithstanding *I am dispensed with to assume any religion heretical* for the propagation of the mother Church's interest, to keep secret and private all her agents' counsels from time to time, as they intrust me, and not to divulge directly or indirectly, by word, writing, or circumstance, whatsoever, but to execute all that shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me, by you, my ghostly father, or any of this sacred convent. All which I, A. B., do swear by the blessed Trinity, and the blessed sacrament, which I now am to receive, to perform, and on my part keep inviolably; and do call all the heavenly and glorious hosts of heaven to witness these my real intentions, to keep this my oath. In testimony hereof, I take this most holy and blessed sacrament of the eucharist; and witness the same farther with my hand and seal in the face of this holy convent this——day of——, An. Dom.," &c. *C. Advocate.*

The Catholic Church is infallible, of course immutable, consequently the same in republican Protestant America in the nineteenth century, as in monarchial Catholic Europe in the seventeenth.

—

Now the question is—Of what use are oaths of allegiance to our government, or to any Protestant state or government, however

solemnly taken, after a person has bound himself by all that he holds sacred, not to keep them? *Ed. M. H.*

POPERY.

ARE the following propositions true? And if so, are not the best days of the Republic numbered?—They are from the New York observer:—

Popery is a *political system*, *despotic* in its organization, *anti-democratic*, and *anti-republican*, and cannot therefore coexist with American republicanism.

The ratio of *increase of popery*, is the exact ratio of *decrease of civil liberty*.

The *dominance of popery* in the United States is the *certain destruction of our free institutions*.

Popery, by its organization, is wholly under the control of a *foreign despotic sovereign*.

Austria, *one of the Holy Alliance af Sovereigns* leagued against the liberties of the world, has the superintendence of the operations of popery in this country.

The agents of Austria in the United States are Jesuits and priests in the pay of that foreign power, in active correspondence with their employers abroad, not bound by ties of any kind to our government or country, but, on the contrary, impelled by the strongest motives of ambition, to serve the interests of a despotic foreign government: which ambition has already, in one or more instances, been gratified, by promotion of these agents to higher office and wealth in Europe.

Popery is a union *of church and state*, nor can popery exist in this country in that plenitude of power which it claims as a divine right, and which, in the very nature of the system, it must continually strive to obtain, until such a union is consummated. Popery, on this ground, therefore, is destructive to our religious, as well as civil liberty.

Popery is more dangerous and more formidable than any power in the United States, on the ground that, through its *despotic organization*, it can concentrate its efforts for any purpose, with complete effect, and that organization being wholly under foreign control, it can have no real sympathy with any thing American. The funds, and intellect, and intriguing experience of all papal and despotic Europe, by means of agents at this moment organized throughout our land, can, at any time, be brought in aid of the enterprises of foreign powers in this country.

A New Creed and a New Party.

"THE INDEPENDENT CONGREGATIONAL UNION."

I HAVE just read "the Constitution of the Independent Congregational Union of the Western Reserve, adopted at Williamsfield, October 29, 1834. Pittsburg: *Ephraim Lloyd*, Printer." 23 pages, 12mo.

Digitized by Google

The most singular fact connected with the history of this new Constitution, is, that it is the workmanship of the author of "The Supreme and Exclusive Authority of the Lord Jesus Christ in Religious Matters, maintained: and the Rights, Liberties, and Privileges of the Children of God established from the Sacred Scriptures, in opposition to the *assumed powers* of Ecclesiastics. In two parts—by *John Tassey*, Pastor of the Congregational Church, Pittsburg." This work was noticed and reviewed in the *Christian Baptist*, vol. 4. The device and project I have understood has emanated from one of the opponents of the *assumed powers* of ecclesiastics; amongst which assumed powers that of making creeds is by him acknowledged to be one.

As another humiliating instance of human weakness and instability, from which I pray we may all be admonished, I record the new terms of communion, or the new creed of the new sect, with the explanation appended by the author.

1st. *The Explanation.*

The creed, or terms of communion, is the third article of the Constitution; concerning which article our author says—

"The third article specifies the basis of union which we now propose to effect among our churches and brethren generally. In the framing of the third head we have introduced nothing but the essential principles of the gospel, which every genuine christian will acknowledge at first sight; and however some may be disposed to cavil at some of the particulars introduced therein, yet we are persuaded that every christian church, which has been formed on correct apostolic principles, will give their hearty assent to this, as expressing that foundation of hope and union laid in the Scriptures by the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. It is not, therefore, to be supposed that any christian church can reasonably object to any of the particulars which are comprised under this head, inasmuch, especially, as almost throughout, the very language of the Scriptures has been carefully interwoven with its phraseology."

We shall now extract the third article of the Constitution, by which every man may know whether he is "a *genuine* christian" and a member of "any christian church:" for the author says, "Every genuine christian will acknowledge the principles of the creed at *first sight;* and it is not even "*to be supposed* that any christian church can *reasonably* object to any of the particulars:"—

"Any christian church or churches, established upon apostolic or congregational principles, and believing in the fallen condition of man, and in that everlasting covenant of peace and redemption which God hath established with his people, in Christ, before the foundation of the world; or, in other words, if they believe that all men are in a depraved, ruined, and condemned state by nature; that in infinite mercy and love, God sent his Son into the world to magnify the divine law and make it honorable, by fulfilling all its demands, and dying under its penalty or curse, as the substitute of sinners, that he might thereby work out and bring in an everlasting righteousness, adapted

Digitized by Google

to meet the desperate condition of fallen man—that through faith in this divine righteousness the sinner is freely justified and saved, inasmuch as it is unto, or upon, or imputed, to all who believe—if they believe that Jesus Christ is the Supreme God, or, as John expresses it, "the True God and Eternal Life"—that his atonement is all-sufficient, even able to save the very chief of sinners—and if they acknowledge him to be their only Saviour, Lawgiver, and King, believing that through his grace and the sanctifying influences of his Spirit, he will keep them by his mighty power through faith unto eternal salvation—and that he will at last come to judge the living and the dead, and render to all men according to their deeds—and finally, if they have taken the Scriptures for their only guide in matters of religion: any such church or churches, on application, shall be admitted to all the privileges connected with this union."

Among the essential principles of the gospel, which every genuine christian will acknowledge at first sight, there are several which I cannot see, after looking at them till my eyes fail. Of these are,

1. The everlasting covenant which God has established *with his people* in Christ *before the foundation of the world*. Whether this be the gospel, or a principle of it; and what it is that was established *with his people* before they were created, I do not at first, second, or third sight, see. Must I, then, conclude that I am not a genuine christian?

2. Again, I never saw in King James' Bible that something which our opponent of the *assumed powers of ecclesiastics* calls "*divine* righteousness," through faith in which the sinner is freely justified. Neither Moses, nor any of the Prophets, nor Apostles, ever use the phrase; and therefore I want the author of "the Supreme and Exclusive Authority of Christ" to give me something else than the *assumed power* of an ecclesiastic for this important item, by faith in which the sinner is justified.

3. Again, he requires every genuine christian at first sight to believe "that Jesus Christ is the Supreme God." Now as I can form no idea of a Supreme God without an inferior God, I am unable at first sight to see the propriety of introducing, 1834 years after the birth of Christ, a new title for him. We may with impunity confer titles on our fellow-citizens when they deserve them; but I demand of the author of this new title, this authority from him "who has the supreme and exclusive authority" to confer names and titles on all created things, as well as to reveal the Father and himself, for his authority thus to designate "the Son of God." I can neither see the *reasonableness* of it, and I am sure that no inspired man ever called the Son of God *the Supreme God*.

These are the terms of communion of the *Independent* Congregational Church. For my part, I neither see in the name, or creed, or constitution of this church, one single idea in advance of the New England Congregationalists or English Presbyterians. With them they take into this Independent Congregational Union, on the ground of the covenant of circumcision, all the natural descendants of the

Digitized by Google

flesh. They have christian brethren and sisters that can neither read, write, nor speak—all their infants are elect infants—the people of God, sanctified from the womb, and made heirs of all the blessings of the New Testament by virtue of the faith of their parents.

They are, however, very much opposed to the Pope and the Catholic religion; and there is something which they call *liberty*, of which they often speak; and to support and preserve which they are very explicit in this document; but with all this love and defence of liberty, they will not allow their own children to choose whether they will submit to Jesus Christ, or the church of which they shall become members; but impose upon them before they can distinguish their right hand from their left, the religion which they themselves think best for them. If this be not the essence of Popery, I have yet to learn the meaning of that word.

This sect has no attribute which can make it grow: it is so like Presbyterianism, so perfectly Calvinian, that no Arminian nor Calvinian can find in it a single argument to forsake the party into which he was introduced in his infancy—unless it be the charm of the name *Independent Congregational Union*.

There are some *views* expressed concerning the independence of churches, and the necessity of co-operation among christians in the promotion of the best interests of mankind, which are all scriptural enough, and in accordance with the Old England and New England Congregational principles. But I see no more necessity for choosing a new name and making a new party, however small, on all the points of difference between the "Congregationalists" and the "Independent Congregationalists," than there is for making two sects on the difference between *sub* and *super* applied to *lapsarians*.

EDITOR

CO-OPERATION.

Brother Campbell,

I AM glad that I have it in my power to communicate the good news that the churches in Clinton and Green counties, Ohio, have met by their Messengers on the 17th inst. at Wilmington, for the purpose of selecting one or more evangelists, and appropriating for them a sustenance—while they are engaged in the *re-proclamation of the gospel* to the world in order to the obedience of the faith.

But I regret to add that some of the brethren are opposed to the measure. They so much fear that we will fall into some of the old sectarian tracks, that they would prefer idleness to the doing of any thing. They have not observed the numerous figures which have been applied to the church; or if they have, they have not noticed the significancy of those terms: such as "the bride," "the Lamb's wife," "the pillar of the truth," &c. &c. from all of which figures we learn that the church is "the body" through which the world is acted

Digitized by Google

upon; or, in other words, the church is the instrument appointed by God to convert the world, or the church is God's army for the purpose of destroying sin. However, the fears of those brethren are not entirely unfounded. Some have already mistaken the use of evangelists: they suppose that they are designed to preach to the churches instead of to the world. In fact, there are many who suppose that the gospel was appointed for the benefit of the saints, or that it was to be preached to the saints. But Jesus commanded the Apostles to preach it to the world, that by the foolishness of preaching the world might be saved.

Your essays, especially No. 2, on the Reformation, is to the point. Excuse haste. ,

As ever yours,

M. WINANS.

I am glad to hear that the brethren in many places are waking up to a sense of their responsibility in reference to the conversion of the world. If they do not act, as well as think and talk about this duty enjoined on them, they will be ashamed of themselves when they think of appearing before the King; who, during his absence, has enjoined it upon his disciples to let their "light shine"—to "contend for the faith"—to regard themselves in their church capacity as "the pillar and support of the truth"—as those by whom the word of the Lord is "to run," "sound forth," "and be glorified"—as left on earth to *leaven* the whole mass of society with the doctrine of the Reign of Heaven.

That we should be fearful of doing wrong by setting a bad example, is reasonable enough; but that christians should do nothing for the conversion of the world beyond the immediate influence of their personal behaviour, must spring from a morbid sensibility, from a sort of mental or moral dyspepsia, of which they ought to be cured if possible; for to do nothing, is to set an example more injurious to society than any other of which I can conceive a christian capable. We are all accustomed to expect that a benevolent mind, possessed of some valuable knowledge, will be active in blessing others according to the value which he esteems it to have been to himself. It is of the very essence of goodness to be communicative; and as we are doubly blessed in blessing others, there is nothing which can impart purer delight to an intelligent christian than the thought that he has been instrumental in the salvation of one of his own race. For certainly if angels rejoice over one returning sinner, he who may be the means or the instrument of such a glorious event, may rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

Co-operation among christian churches in all the affairs of the common salvation, is not only inscribed on every page of apostolic history, but is itself of the very essence of the christian institution. The kingdom of the Messiah is one and indivisible—one body and one spirit. The innumerable little communities of which it is composed are but so many component parts of Christ's body, all animated by his Spirit. They as naturally coalesce under the dominion of spiritual

Digitized by Google

gravitation as the particles of matter in one globe make one mass under the sovereignty of physical attraction.

So perfect is the union, communion, and co-operation under Christ the living head, that if one member suffer, is honored or dishonored, all members sympathize with it. Every individual member and every individual community has its own private and personal rights and privileges, as it has its own identity; but in all things necessary to the growth, prosperity, honor and happiness of the body, there is but one interest, feeling, aim, and effort. Like the ten thousand families of the royal tribe of Judah, while each had its own possessions, rights, immunities, and discipline, in all that pertained to the tribe, they flowed together as the drops of rain within the banks of the Jordan.

Should any one ask how far this co-operation is to be carried, we would answer in general terms, To the utmost bounds of every obligation arising from the love of Christ to the church, and from his general philanthropy exhibited in his tasting death for all. In its details it comprehends all that can be done for the purity, peace, and prosperity of the Israel of God, and for the salvation of all the ends of the earth. Churches are, then, to co-operate in prayer, in counsel, in combined efforts, in giving and receiving all sorts of aid, as times, circumstances, and exigencies may demand. They are to put forth all their energies and all their means of doing good while ever there is good to be done, at home or abroad, until the knowledge of the glory of God cover the whole earth as the waters cover the bosom of the ocean.

There is too much squeamishness about the *manner* of co-operation. Some are looking for a model similar to that which Moses gave for building the tabernacle. These seem not to understand that this is as impossible as it would be incompatible with the genius of the gospel. A model for translating the Scriptures from Greek into Latin, and from Latin into the English, French, and Spanish tongues; a model for making types, paper, ink, and for printing the Bible, might be as rationally expected, as a model for the co-operation of churches on the banks of the Ohio for republishing the gospel in the valley of the Mississippi.

The only model that could be given, is, that the first churches in Judea, Samaria, Galatia, &c. &c. did all they could in the way of sending out and supporting those who labored in the gospel among the heathen, and that they did it in the best manner they could. For them they prayed, and for them they contributed all carnal or temporal things, according to their several ability and the demands of society. Let us, then, go and do likewise, and not spend our days in talking about the ways and means, and in doing nothing.

Some christians ought never to pray in public, on the principle they refuse to co-operate. They are afraid of setting a bad example—of not acting perfectly right. Well, they may set a bad example in the matter or manner of their prayers in public, and err both in matter and manner. Ought they, then, always to refuse to pray! If

Digitized by Google

not, then let them not refuse to do all they can in co-operating with their brethren in the furtherance of the gospel. And if they can show a more rational or scriptural plan of going to work in this great design of reforming the church and saving the world, let them come and show it, and demonstrate their willingness to come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty EDITOR.

'The Last Days.'

Remarks on the Communication of J. B.—No. 2, page 84.

DEAR SIR,

I AM much obliged to you for your favor laid before my readers in my last paper. I have, in the multiplicity of my engagements, forgotten to attend to a request of some correspondent, received some time ago, to lay before my readers the scriptural import of the phrase "*the last days*." You have brought it to my recollection, and I proceed to offer a few remarks upon it.

The phrase in the Old Testament occurs only three times, and in the New Testament five times. It does not appear to be restricted specially to the conclusion of either the Jewish or Christian times. Jacob uses it when foretelling the fortunes of his twelve sons in all subsequent time. Isaiah and Micah use it with reference to the gospel age. And Peter, in quoting Joel, applies it to the conclusion of the Jewish age and the commencement of the Christian. Paul uses it in reference to the times subsequent to his own; and then it seems to include the last dispensation, or all the times from the first to the second coming of the Messiah.

The reader will please consult the following passages:—Gen. xlix. 1. Isaiah ii. 2. Micah iv. 1. Acts ii. 17. 2 Tim. iii. 1. James v. 3. Heb. i. 2. 2 Peter iii. 3.—from which he will perceive that it represents not only the last days of the Jewish state, but also the gospel age. We have the phrase "*last time*" and "*last times*" on four occasions—1 Peter i. 5, 20. 1 John ii. 18. Jude 18, confined to the times from the manifestation of Jesus to his second coming. We live in "the perilous times of the last days"—"the times of scoffers"—of antichrists, and not in that period of the last times when the mountain of the Lord's house is to be exalted above all the hills, when all nations shall form one communion, and wars exist no more.

The *last days*, or *times*, therefore, include the whole period from the first to the second coming of the Messiah—both the good and bad times—the ordinary and the extraordinary times of the gospel dispensation: I say, they include all these times, but do not always refer to the whole period, nor exclusively to that period; and, therefore, must always be understood with reference to the subject before the speaker. Thus Jacob alluded to the future and remote history of his descendants; and James to the final overthrow of the Jewish state—Isaiah and Micah to the triumphant period of christian history, called

Digitized by Google

the Millennium. Paul and Peter, once at least; and John, more than once, to the apostacy, and the defections from the christian faith which we have lived to see.

Touching the gift of the Holy Spirit nothing decisive can be learned from this phrase. Brother Winans thinks it would greatly relieve the christian institution from the mystery and mysticism of the schools, and from the enthusiasm of the age, if it could be clearly ascertained that the Spirit of God exerts no influence, abstract from the word, upon the mind of saint or sinner; and you, my dear sir, think that to teach that the Spirit of God does not previously dispose and prepare the heart of the sinner to believe the gospel, is dishonorable to God and flattering to the pride and self-sufficiency of the deceitful heart of man.

You both agree that there is much mysticism, fanaticism, and enthusiasm in the world, growing out of the popular systems. But you fear that in rooting out the tares, he will also root out the wheat of sound doctrine, to speak in modern style; or, that while cutting out the cancer, the Doctor will cut into the heart, and make it indeed a dead letter. I can appreciate, and I think do justice to the purity of your zeal for the honor of God and for his word. I esteem you as equally zealous to know, to practise, and to teach the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth on this and all other subjects. You both make your appeal to the Scriptures, and are equally concerned to know what the Spirit testifies to the churches. One thing, however, you may both, perhaps, have a little too much of—the philosophy of this speculating age—and may, without knowing it, be somewhat biassed by the indirect influence of early associations. I say, *perhaps* this may be so; and therefore the difficulty of understanding the whole testimony of God on the work of the Holy Spirit.

With you I cannot think of cutting off the heart of saint or sinner from any divine influence—for then I could not pray that "the Lord would send forth laborers into his vineyard;" "that the word of the Lord may run and be glorified;" for neither of these could be answered unless the Lord in some manner disposed the hearts of men; neither could I "pray for the peace of Jerusalem;" "that all Israel might be saved;" "for the peace of the city;" "for them that despitely use me and persecute me;" "for the unity of them who believe in Jesus;" nor "for the sanctification of them that believe." All of which I am taught to do by the Lord and his Apostles and Prophets.

And with brother Winans, I cannot think of teaching abstract spirit more than abstract word. I am not authorized to think, believe, or teach that God works in the heart of saint or sinner by any other means than by his word; nor that the heart of saint or sinner can be disposed to any object but through a previous knowledge of that object. A person must know the Lord before he can trust in him or love him; and this knowledge is not communicated to any person but through the word.

Nor can I pray to the Lord "*to bless his word*," because no Apostle or Prophet did so; and because it is as unreasonable as unscriptural

Digitized by Google

to ask the Lord to bless his blessing, or to bless his grace. It is also, in my judgment, without any authority from God, and most contrary to the Apostles, to teach sinners to wait for any assistance from Heaven, to believe in Jesus, or to lead them to think that they cannot believe without help, or that the Spirit of God must first regenerate them before they can understand his word. This, in my judgment, is an empty, and false, and ruinous philosophy.

Nor is it scriptural to preach to men that they can believe if they will, or that they are able to do this or that, unless they are bewildered by science falsely so called; but as God commands all men every where to reform, or believe the gospel; so we ought to preach Christ, and no theory of conversion or abstract influence. But should any one imagine that we therefore discard all divine influence upon the hearts of saints or sinners, he would not only argue most illogically, but also do us a great injury. For "in God we live, are moved, and do exist." It is he that makes the grass to grow—that arrays the herbage —that feeds the ravens, and preserves the sparrow. It is he that turns the hearts of men, and leads them into right paths. It is he that restrains the wicked devices, and turns the wicked counsels of wicked men into foolishness. But he works by the laws of nature in the natural world, and by the word of his grace in the spiritual world. And as we make use of all rational means to preserve ourselves after we have prayed to the Lord for protection, so we make use of all spiritual means to be pure, holy, and happy, after we have prayed to the Lord to sanctify and save us.

I would appeal to your good sense whether it is not more salutary, because more rational and scriptural, to proclaim *the Word*, than to preach *the Spirit*—to exhort, persuade, and beseech sinners to be reconciled to God, than to lecture them as philosophers upon some theory of spiritual operations, which no man from the East to the West either understands or can explain, and which, when assented to, neither converts the sinner nor edifies the saint. For my part, I choose to do as the Apostles did, rather than to theorize with any philosopher of Geneva or Amsterdam upon the mode of God's existence, or the mode of his operations on saints or sinners. I wish to be led by the Spirit; and when I imitate the first preachers, I am led by the Spirit; but when I theorize and deal in human philosophy, I am led by a fallacious and deceitful guide. To the law and to the testimony is my appeal; and may it ever be the man of our counsel and the guide of our lives! EDITOR.

P. S.—You say I stand upon a pinnacle, &c. and that many who fear God stand aloof on account of their fears of my teaching the doctrine of spiritual operations. I cannot help those fears, inasmuch as I have fully expressed myself in all the words and phrases which the Holy Spirit has employed to represent things, and in the fullest import of that language according to the established rules of interpretation. Now if I must choose between the adoption of their unauthorized language of Ashdod, and their standing aloof, I must prefer the latter alternative to the former: because that would be to abandon

Digitized by Google

the ground on which I have raised my voice against all the sects and parties in christendom—that would be to dishonor the Holy Spirit by preferring the words of man's wisdom to those authorized by the Spirit of wisdom and revelation—and to place human creeds above the oracles of God.

They whose fears are taught by the words and philosophy of men, can only be cured by that philosophy; and therefore I, not having that philosophy to offer, cannot allay those fears. And were I in possession of it I dare not use it for such a purpose, because in allaying the fears of one class I would only excite the fears of another. Please regard my fourth letter to Mr. William Jones as a reply to this part of your letter. ED.

LOCKS FOR MEETING-HOUSES.

JAMESTOWN, O. November 24, 1834.

Dear brother Campbell,

WE allow any body, of any sect or denomination whatsoever, to preach in our meeting-house: Provided always, nevertheless, that if they attack the doctrine taught by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, (alleging that they aim at error held by somebody; or when they act manfully, and say, that we are a deluded set, following a phantom of A. Campbell's discovery,) we reserve the right of reply, that the people may judge for themselves who it is that are following cunningly devised fables. And we have found *this reserved right to reply* to be one of the *safest locks* that was ever put upon the door of a meeting-house. We would recommend it as the best lock ever invented to preserve *truth*. Error will never enter the door if the lock be visible; and if, without noticing the lock, it should enter, its unpleasant situation is soon manifested by deep groans and a kind of sanctimonious visage, calculated to excite sympathy.

I have sometimes thought that this was the only kind of lock that ought to be put on the doors of meeting-houses. THE TEMPLE, which was expressly built for the Lord, had no other lock that we read of. The Lord and his Apostles taught in it, as well as the Scribes and others, and when the Sanhedrim threatened the Apostles, and forbid them to preach, they did not lock the doors of the Temple, nor did the Jews ever lock their synagogues against the Apostles. But if *error* be the thing taught in meeting-houses, *an iron lock* would be better calculated to prevent innovation than the lock above recommended for the preservation of truth.

M. WINANS.

JAMESTOWN, O. December 8th, 1834.

Dear brother Campbell,

I HAVE just been looking over a communication written by me, and sent to the *Western Christian Advocate*, on the 3d of Novem-

Digitized by Google

ber, which was written as a reply to J. N. H. who wrote an essay on John iii. & 5. in said paper, of which I had taken some notice before, which notice was published; but when my second went to hand, the Editor said, "Enough for the present," and refused to publish it; whereupon I ordered it returned to me, and have just enclosed it, in the same envelope, to the Rev. *William Winans*, a cousin of mine, who resides in Mississippi, to show him that the cause of tho Advocate is lame, having but one leg.

But while thinking about these matters, it just occurred to me that the Book of God published both sides. From the very beginning the devil's arguments are given, and the success of his arguments fully recorded, notwithstanding his sophistry was more successful than the simple truths of God; and in all the book the arguments of the devil are fairly stated, and the success of his arguments fully acknowledged. But in this our day the reverse of this is the course pursued by the scribes, with but few exceptions. This proves that they are influenced by another spirit, or by the spirit of another god. I think it is not hard to distinguish the journals that advocate *truth* from those that advocate *error*—those that are for the truth have two sides, and those that are for error have but one side.

As ever yours, M. WINANS.

Religious Controversy.

I HAVE not met with any thing for some time that does more justice to my views of religious controversy, than the following excerpts from some old book, forwarded by brother *Flemming* of Kentucky. I thank him for his trouble in transcribing them, and with pleasure lay them before my readers.

Ed. M. H.

If it were to be determined by a general ballot, what particular class of writers should be condemned to everlasting silence, polemic divines would infallibly be honored with the first majority. They would in the first place be proscribed by members of their own faculty among whom the sedate and orderly sons of discretion are forever declaring their aversion to all religious disputation as dangerous to ecclesiastical foundations, blessing their stars that the repose and emoluments of an establishment have set them above the temptation of seeking their bread or their fame out of the beaten track of authorized and orthodox confessions.

With those would agree statesmen and politicians, whose plans and enterprizes might be grievously embarassed by theological disquisitions, of which history affords multitudes of examples. Lawyers, physicians, and philosophers of different classes might perhaps foresee little or no inconvenience in debate, with which their studies and occupations are understood to have so little connexion. The suffrage of these, however, must of course be conformable to the taste of their

Digitized by Google

clients, patients, and patrons. On another hand, the professor in *polite* literature, the connoisseur in the fine and the adepts in the *finer* arts, perfectly shudder at the sight of any thing that has a scholastic or a theological air. The spectres of the indelicate *Luther* and the horrid *Calvin* are ever before their eyes, and the sound of the axes and hammers, wherewith their disciples broke down all the carved work of the mother and mistress of music, painting, and sculpture, is still in their ears; and if future debates should bring on a farther degree of what these zealots called reformation, who can answer that a single Modena of any character might survive the storm. In one word, this general disaffection to religious controversy is so prevalent, that if we believe the monthly writers who cater for readers of all tastes and complexions, there is not one stomach in a thousand that can digest it. Controversial divinity is accordingly represented in their collections, as stale, insipid, meagre, and nauseous, and, in general, fit for nothing but to be returned upon the hands of those who bring it to market.

There have been times, however, when it bore a better character, and found a more equitable and even honorable reception; for what particular services may be understood by the following account of the age of *Thomas Becket*, taken from Mr. David Hume, a witness in the present case:—

"The spirit of superstition was so prevalent, that it infallibly caught every careless reasoner, much more every one whose interest, honor, and ambition were engaged to support it. All the wretched literature of the times was enlisted on that side. Some faint glimmerings of common sense might sometimes pierce through the thick cloud of ignorance; or, what was worse, the illusion of perverted science, which had blotted out the sun, and enveloped the face of nature. But those who reserved themselves untainted from the general contagion, proceeded on no principles which they could pretend to justify. They were more beholding to their total want of instruction than to their knowledge, if they still retained some share of understanding. Folly was possessed of all the schools as well as all the churches, and her votaries assumed the garb of philosophers, together with the ensigns of spiritual dignities. To disperse these clouds of folly and superstition, was, I apprehend, from the very nature of the case, the proper work of theological controversy; and this work history informs us theological controversy performed. *Roger Bacon* was one of the first who felt the incumberance of superstition, and the influence it had in controlling all his endeavors to propagate learning and science in various branches. He was obliged to fight his way through many established follies and absurdities, in order to introduce those amazing plans which are still doing honor to his name and memory. It is true he so far failed that superstition still kept its ground and prevented in a great measure the raising of any superstructures of consequence upon Bacon's foundations for full two hundred years. At length arose Martin Luther, who consigned all his powers to theological controversy, laid bare the superstition of the times to the very

Digitized by Google

root, and exposed it in all its deformity to the view of the whole world. From this period true religion and useful learning sprung up together at a thousand openings, were cherished by the kindly head of patronage and emulation, and plentifully watered by the free course of rational debate, to which the uncontrolled examination of the Scriptures gave occasion."

The wrath, acrimony, insolence, and dogmatic spirit of some controversial writings are, we own, indefensible. They are not pardonable in those who have the best cause in the world, and are, in other respects, able defenders of it. Nevertheless, these are, in some instances, necessary evils; in others, will admit of extenuation. In some men a meagre spirit is the fault of constitution. From others, even good men, angry or satyrical expressions may be forced by just provocations. "If any where," (says one of our great grand fathers,) "I have used more sharpness than is pleasing to men who would have all polemical writings managed without passion, I shall only say, that the Doctor's hard grating hath sharpened my style and made it more keen and piercing than I could have allowed myself to use towards a good-natured adversary. It is almost morally impossible for him who contends with a fiery and furious antagonist, not to be sometimes a little over-heated."

Mr. Bayle, in one of his fits of candor, finds fault with Mr. Claude for saying, in excuse of Luther's intemperate style, that perhaps there was some particular necessity at the time of the Reformation to employ the strongest expressions to awaken men from that profound slumber in which they had lain so long. Whereupon Mr. Bayle observed, that, because God is pleased sometimes to make use of such instruments, it will not follow that violence and passion are commendable upon the pretence that the corruption of the world needs the harshest treatment. I apprehend Mr. Claude did not think of commending Luther's passion and violence; on the contrary, he wished he had been more temperate in his writings. So do I, if his intemperance upon any occasion led him into calumny or falsehood; which in descending to particular instances would bear a dispute. For the rest, if the times wanted Luther, they wanted him with all his appurtenances; nor could his zeal, or what is called his intemperance, have been spared without wanting the reformation too.

After all, may there not be a little affectation in this general clamor against warm and satyrical disputants? Is human nature so totally mortified in all those who pretend to be scandalized at this way of managing controversy, that they immediately throw by every book which has any sprinklings of *Attic salt*, or even of *Roman wormwood?* But the most provoking circumstance is, that numbers of writers complain of this offensive acrimony in others, who are much less faulty than themselves. These should never be looked upon in any other light than seeking apologies for indulging their own licentious genius at the expense of much better men than themselves, who never gave them the least pretence for retaliations of this kind; of which some very striking examples might be produced.

Digitized by Google

Perhaps, if one were to inquire strictly into the cause why certain rescripts, of no small intrinsic merit, and on no trifling subject, have met with so cool a reception in the world, it would be found that the gentle, modest, and pacific manner in which the authors of them have delivered their sentiments, has contributed more than any thing else to their being so little regarded.

JONAH, THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS IN THE STOMACH OF THE GREAT FISH.

IN looking over our file of Queries, we discover that most of them have been before answered in the previous volumes of our works. We shall, therefore, formally attend only to one at this time, and that has been partially attended to before. The others we will engross in our essays.

Query.—Was Jesus Christ three days and three nights in the heart of the earth; and was Jonah three days and three nights in the stomach of the great fish?

Answer.—Yes; and yet he rose the third day.

The solution of this difficulty will be found in the following considerations:—The Hebrews had no word to express what we call a *natural day.* What the Greeks express in a word which properly signifies "a night day," the Jews expressed by "a day and a night." That space of time which consists of a revolution of twenty-four hours and a part of two others, in their style is fitly expressed by three days and three nights. Whitby, Pearce, and Lowth have satisfactorily shown that the Jews were wont to reckon any part of a day as a day. As, then, the Messiah was interred on Friday, lay in the grave all Saturday, and rose on the first day of the next week; he was, in their idiom, and according to our own figure of speech, called *synecdoche*, or comprehension, in the grave three days and three nights.

The scoffs of sceptics on "the whale story of Jonah," as they stupidly and impiously call it, are placed in the proper attitude of contempt when it is understood that Jonah was in this respect one of the *typical* persons of the symbolic institution. That God should in his wisdom and mercy ordain a system of prospective figures, of the greatest variety and beauty, consisting of persons and things, times and places, all together forming a copious and exact prophetic history of the Messiah and his kingdom many centuries before his birth, while it is a subject of derision to the sceptic, is a matter of much entertainment and grateful admiration to all intelligent persons, confirmatory of their faith in the Messiah; and like a perennial spring, a never-failing source of consolation to all who thirst after the water of life. Christians in this age of scoffing—of atheistical and infideladventure, should be well versed in the evidences of the gospel, and be always ready to give a good reason for their trust in God and hope in his salvation. The Old Testament types and figures—its history

Digitized by Google

and prophecy, are of more value than all the science of the schools to those who would triumphantly put to flight the armies of the aliens and gather fruit to eternal life.

The times call for a more profound and accurate development of the evidences of revealed religion, than is to be found in any one work on that subject. We have in contemplation a work of that sort; and in the mean time, at the suggestion of many of our patrons, we shall soon commence a series of essays on the evidences of the gospel as preparatory to the work in prospect.

Christians, read your Bibles, and give up your whole persons, body, soul, and spirit to the guidance of God's good Spirit; and all the hosts of darkness may in vain assail your hope in the resurrection of the just.

EDITOR.

SERMON ON ECCLESIASTES xi. 1.

"Cast thy bread upon the waters, and thou shalt find it after many days."

VERNON, *Ind. Jennings county*, January 2, 1835.

Brother A. Campbell,

SIR—IT is with satisfaction that I attempt to address this note to you, knowing that it always affords satisfaction to a good man to know that his labors are beneficial to mankind. You, probably, on seeing the name subscribed to this, will remember of having received a letter upwards of a year ago, bearing the same signature of this within, in rather a curious style. Things that have transpired since that time prompts me to write these lines to you, that you may have some knowledge of the influence of your labors. At the time I wrote to you I was an avowed sceptic, seeking the productions of man to condemn the truth of God; and amongst other things I wanted to glean from your works what I could find in them whereby I might oppose the Scriptures; and my idea in representing myself in a very poor condition, was to see if you would send me the Harbinger without the prospect of earthly remuneration; for I had been taught that you labored for the fleece and not for the sheep, as I was convinced from observation that the sectarian world pursued that kind of a course. But not to be tedious, having wrote the letter for the purposes I have expressed, and not much expecting it would be noticed by you, (as I thought the money was all you wanted;) though on the return mail from the East, what should I see but the Extra Harbinger, and the current volume of the same, as I had requested. Being a little surprised that so singular a letter should be noticed and complied with, I was led to exclaim, "There is more than money that prompts thee on!" and having read the Scriptures that I might find their defects to oppose them, I had become acquainted with the matter they contained; and upon reading your Extra through, I found myself lost. Instead of finding grounds to condemn, I found the Scriptures abundantly proved; and from that time I read and compared the

Digitized by Google

Scriptures with what you advanced; and becoming daily more confirmed in God's word as the only way by which we can know him, and that his word reveals the only plan by which we can be saved, I ventured to put my trust in Jesus; and truly have since realized what it is to be in Christ, rooted and built up—the body dead because of sin, but the spirit life through obedience. And now to your labors I attribute what is due to you, and unto God what is due to God. Let no man think more highly of himself than he ought to think.

G. W. B.

I HAVE NO TIME LEFT FOR STUDY.

The idea about the want of time is a mere phantom. Franklin found time in the midst of all his labors, to dive into the hidden recesses of philosophy, and to explore an untrodden path of science. The great Frederic, with an empire at his direction, in the midst of war, on the eve of battles which were to decide the fate of his kingdom, found time to revel in all the charms of philosophy and intellectual pleasures. Bonaparte, with all Europe at his disposal; with kings in his ante-chamber begging for vacant thrones; with thousands of men whose destinies were suspended on the brittle thread of his arbitrary pleasure, had time to converse with books. Cæsar, when he had curbed the spirit of the Roman people, and was thronged with visitors from the remotest kingdom, found time for intellectual cultivation. Every man has time, if he be careful to improve it; and if he does improve it as well as he might, he can reap a three fold reward. Let mechanics then make use of the hours at their disposal, if they want to obtain a proper influence in society. They are the life-blood of the community; they can, if they please, hold in their hands the destinies of our republic; they are numerons, respectable, and powerful; and they have only to be educated half as well as other professions, to make laws to the nation.

Presbyterian.

SCIENCE AND LITERATURE.

Both have their common source in the energies of the human intellect, both call into operation the inventive faculty as well as the judgment; in both, splendor of achievement results from force and intrepidity of genius. But their aims and tendencies must be regarded as essentially distinct. Of science, the paramount object is truth; of literature, the object is beauty. The business of science is to instruct; of literature, the functions are not duly discharged unless delight accompany instruction. Science seeks to convince the understanding: literature, to captivate the heart. Even when the two are so conjoined, by a happy effort of genius, that scientific truths assume the attractions of a literary dress, it is still easy to recognize the separate elements, and assign to each its native province. Thus poetry sometimes sings of celestial phenomena: but

Digitized by Google

it requires no great fund of astronomical learning to detect the results of scientific research and calculation beneath the glittering garb flung round them by the muse. Political economy puts on the disguise of fictitious narrative; but a little attention suffices to remove the mask of the novelist, and reveal the features of the sage. The science of metaphysics owes far the greater part of its fame and popularity to the graces with which literary talent has adorned its speculations; but the meagre army of truths, which these speculations are enabled to marshall, would command small reverence were they banished from the realm of fancy, and forced to array themselves under no banner more gorgeous than their own. *Ibid.*

From the Christian Palladium.

POOR ENCOURAGEMENT FOR PUBLISHERS.

A late number of the Cincinnati Journal contains an abridgement of the report of the Cincinnati Baptist Convention in relation to the religious periodicals of that denomination; together with some remarks from its Editor exhibiting the poor support, not only of Baptist, but of Presbyterian and Congregational religious journals, which we publish to show the precarious nature of all such establishments. Many societies have been too prolific in their plan of operation.—Reading should be more extensively encouraged in all religious congregations and all Christians should be taught that the punctual fulfilment of all their contracts and honorable faithful dealing among men is one part of the Christian religion.

"Increasing the number of religious periodicals, must be attended with immense sacrifices of money. If the history of the religious press in this country could be written, it would be it would be a *tale of woe on the part of the publishers.*

The *Christian Watchman* was for many years a losing concern. The Lowell Evangelist is dead for want of support. A Baptist paper started in Rhode Island, became bankrupt. The Baptists of Connecticut raised $2,000, as a gratuity for a religious paper but it failed fot want of support. *Zion's Advocate is a losing concern.*—The *Vermont Telegraph* has not support. The N. Y. Baptist Register, which has vastly more subscribers than any other paper among the Baptists, cost an immense sum for years in the outset, and now only yields a profit of 300 dollars. The Baptist Repository, of New-York has already ruined the property of our brethren who published it. In Pennsylvania, Baptist brethren have laid out more than 5000 dollars in two papers, neither of which has ever paid its way."

The following statement of the Editor of the Cincinnati Journal tells the condition of several Presbyterian periodicals in this great valley of the Mississippi.

"We will not go over the mountains to rake from their ashes, the Rochester Observer, the Utica Christian Journal, the Albany Telegraph, the New England Christian Herald, &c. &c. &c. which have lived piously and usefully, but died of starvation. We wish not to

Digitized by Google

speak of the Presbyterian which devotes its profits to the 'BOARD OF EDUCATION,' but in five years existence has had no profits to devote—nor of the Philadelphian, which, ably conducted as it is, furnishes no compensation to its able Editor, and involves its publisher in debt.

The Presbyterian press in the great Valley, is all we have to remark upon now. And we begin with the *Pittsburgh Christian Herald*, which the Editor says has less than fifteen hundred nominal, and not more than 1000 *paying* subscribers,—Week after week the publishers' complaints go forth, 'Increase my subscription and pay me better, or I must give up.' How long before the catastrophe will come, none can tell.

The *Ohio Observer*, has about 16 or 1700 paying subscribers: and lives on from week to week as healthy as could be expected with such a support. Paying a small salary to its editor, it has a lean subsistence.

The *Western Luminary*, with 1500 subscribers, probably sustains itself, but it can afford no competent support to an editor without involving the interest of the publisher beyond his receipts.

The *Standard* of Cincinnati cost its publishing committee 4000 dollars out of pocket, and finally was sent away to live cheaper in Indiana.

The *Millennial Trumpeter* of Maryville, Tenn. has between 4 and 500 subscribers. Its existence is a constant loss to the publishers, and in a late expose they avowed themselves almost ready to give up in despair. We hope they will be saved from this catastrophe; but if they fail they will have companions in misfortune. Many have fallen in the same field.

The *St. Louis Observer* is still doubtful, whether it will be able to pass its infancy without fatal disease. Its continued existence is still a problem, unless better support is tendered.

The *Youth's Magazine*, of Cincinnati, has near 1500 subscribers, but thus far it has yielded no profit to the publishers. The editor has never yet received a cent for his services. It lives and only lives.

The *Cincinnati Journal*, has much the largest circulation of any Presbyterian paper of the great Valley; but leaving out of view between 4000 and 5000 dollars lost, in getting the paper started, it even now does not yield one cent of profit to the publishers. With the late improvements, it must have a wider circulation than ever, or its publishers will have no profit on the capital invested."

To these editorial calamities I may add, that the *Christian Index*, which migrated to the South some months since, from Philadelphia, for the sake of its health, has waxed paler and paler, and is now said to be in the last stage of consumption.

"The World" and the "Religious Narrator," of the city of brotherly kindness, after a few feeble pulsations against reformation, sunk into an incurable *atrophy*, and expired.

Mr. Cushman and the "Christian Gazette" next sallied forth upon

Digitized by Google

the arena, and solemnly promised "the profits to the support of domestic missions;" but at the 19th No. of the second volume his lamp went out for the want of oil, and he vanished from our sight.

All these papers have been inveterate opposers of the Reformation. The "Christian Gazette" sunk with an immense cargo of the bales of Mr. Landis, of Delaware, aboard. If his misrepresentations and unfounded imputations, to say nothing of his errors in logic, criticism, and application of scripture only weighed one ton each, they would have sunk the Royal George to the bottom of the Thames. No wonder, then, that the little schooner of the "Christian Gazette," owned and commanded by Mr. Cushman, so suddenly bilged and went to the bottom! *Ed. M. H.*

EARLY RISING.

Buffon rose always with the sun, and he used to tell by what means he had accustomed himself to get out of bed so early. "In my youth," he said, "I was very fond of sleep; it robbed me of a great deal of my time; but my poor Joseph (his domestic) was of great service in enabling me to overcome it. I promised to give Joseph a crown every time that he could get me up at six. The next morning he did not fail to awake and torment me; but he only received abuse. The day after he did the same, with no better success; and I was obliged at noon to confess that I had lost my time. I told him that he did not know how to manage his business; that he ought to think of my promise and not mind my threats. The following day he employed force; I begged for indulgence—I bid him begone—I stormed—but Joseph persisted. I was therefore obliged to comply, and he was rewarded every day for the abuse which he suffered at the moment when I awoke, by thanks, accompanied by a crown, which he received about an hour after. Yes, I am indebted to poor Joseph, for ten or a dozen volumes of my work."

Reformation---No. 4.

REFORMATION OF THE PREACHERS OF REFORMATION.

MY text will be found in the following query:—

"Ought not a reformer to treat all the matters at issue between the disciples and the sects with as much levity as possible, and convert the meeting-house into a place of amusement? Ought he not, in order to expose error with the most effect, to act the part of a religious mountebank, and lampoon and ridicule all the *isms* in christendom, in order to prepare the way for the introduction of the ancient faith?"

Is there in all the ranks of the reformation any accredited proclaimer of the gospel, whose manners and customs could occasion such an interrogation! "An enemy has done this." "No," says a devoted brother, "I have seen it, and felt it, and lamented it; I have blushed for it, and I am mortified exceedingly at the remembrance of

Digitized by Google

it. Another such a visitation from a proclaimer of the word, (I had almost said *declaimer*,) and the cause of reform will be incurably wounded in this town."

If there be such a one, and I hope there is not more than one in this Union, I would most affectionately invite his attention to the following scriptures. Let him first hear how a Jewish preacher, who preached while his brethren were in captivity, was accustomed to feel. His words were, "Oh! that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people!"—"Mine eye runneth down with rivers of water for the destruction of the daughter of my people!" But if this is too remote, and if it be not compatible with christianity that its disciples and its pleaders should be so tender-hearted as the Jews, we will take a lesson from Paul: "You know," says Paul, "that from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons, serving the Lord with all humility of mind and with many tears."—"I wrote to you with many tears." But if this be too apostolic, let us hear what Paul expected from young preachers:—

"Let no man *despise thy youth;* but be an *example* to the believers in word, in behaviour, in love, in spirit, in faith, in purity. In *meekness* instruct them that oppose themselves. In *all things* show thyself a *pattern* of good works. In teaching exhibit incorruptness, *gravity*, sincerity, and wholesome speech."

So taught, by precept and example, the Apostle to the Gentiles. Now although every preacher may not have such tender sensibilities—may not so readily melt into tears—he may at least command himself into gravity; and if he possess godly sincerity, he may exhibit it.

There are two things so superlatively uncomely, that they must excite universal disgust. To see a young man who cannot do more than parse a common sentence of the King's English, mount the stand and lampoon all the Rabbis and Doctors, all the commentators and critics of a thousand years, as a set of fools or knaves—as a pack of dunces or mercenary impostors—is infinitely more nauseating than *lobelia* itself, and shockingly repulsive to all the finer feelings of our nature. Again, to see a person, young or old, appear in the garb of a preacher of righteousness, with the Living Oracles in his hand, addressing us in the name of Jesus Christ; with the flippancy of a comedian, courting smiles, instead of wooing souls to Jesus Christ, acting the religious mountebank, full of levity, displaying wit and seeking the reputation of a smart fellow in the presence of God—is the climax of irreverence as respects God, and inhumanity as respects man. If any thing on earth could excite a sigh or a tear in the honorable group of Apostles and Prophets which now environ the throne of the Eternal, methinks it would be such a sight as that before me, especially were the preacher one who professed to advocate the Apostles' doctrine, in opposition to the doctrines and commandments of men.

Digitized by Google

On this point I think it unnecessary to enlarge. But let the churches take heed whom they patronize and recommend to the public as their organs to the world. With a very slight alteration of a few words, the excellent Cowper has sketched in the following lines the character before us, and has administered a rebuke which ought to touch the heart of every christian:—

He that negociates between God and man,
As God's ambassador, the grand concerns
Of judgment and of mercy, should beware
Of lightness in his speech. 'Tis pitiful
To court a grin, when you should woo a soul:
To break a jest, when pity would inspire
Pathetic exhortation; and t' address
The skittish fancy with facetious tales,
When sent with God's commission to the heart!
So did not Paul. Direct me to a quip
Or merry turn in all he ever wrote,
And I consent you take it for your text,
Your only one, till sides and benches fail.
No: he was serious in a serious cause,
And understood too well the weighty terms
That he had ta'en in charge. He would not stoop
To conquer those by jocular exploits,
Whom truth and soberness assail'd in vain.

TASK—Book ii.

We have heard of some preachers only a little smitten with this disease, who have made the ancient order of things to send forth a more offensive savor than Solomon's dead fly in the ointment of the apothecary. They are effectual proclaimers so far as turning away the ears of the people from the words of eternal life is regarded as proof of their powers. I have always found it more difficult to obtain an audience in the wake of one of these heralds, than to turn the unprejudiced from darkness to light, and from the bondage of Satan to the perfect liberty of Jesus Christ our Redeemer.

EDITOR.

MR. CAMPBELL'S THEORY.

By ALLEN CROCKER, *of Brookville, New York.*

From the Christian Palladium.

Mr. Editor—IN the midst of perilous times and under peculiar circumstances, I have once more turned my eyes on the pages of divine revelation to find out the sum, and learn whether every thing now published to the world for gospel, or what part of it would be justified by the plain language of revelation. For more than two months past I have given nearly my whole time to the study of the Bible, with a prayerful heart, "comparing spiritual things with spiritual." I have at length arrived at certain points, conclusions, and demonstrations. Among other errors in the course of my research, I have discovered in the theories of modern times, I have clearly appreciated the strength and weakness of Mr. Campbell's system of pretended ancient gospel. As I supposed in the onset that there must be a capital error either in his

Digitized by Google

doctrine or in the understanding which he has given to the world of it, from the knowledge of the fact that it has been exerting a bad influence on the minds and lives of those who have embraced it in the circle of my acquaintance. The leading error in Mr. Campbell's views is attributable to a want of proper distinction between the former revelation of the gospel to the Apostles and Prophets, and the former administration of that gospel by the Apostles to others; in which it appears that a divine power or influence was just as necessarily to be exerted in their administering the gospel to others, as in the revelation of it to the Apostles: and in their confirming the truth and divine originality of the gospel by "mighty signs and wonders." When it is fairly shown what are the effects produced by the gospel at the present day, when duly administered, what will then remain to be accomplished by baptism and other external ceremonies, will be fully realized by every humble inquirer.

Mr. Campbell has thrown out some things, which, if rightly understood, properly applied, and kept within due bounds, would confer a greater favor on christianity than has been realized in past centuries. But as they have been construed and understood by many of his votaries, they have become a viper, gnawing upon the vitals of christianity!

I have resolved a whole view of the gospel in the following questions:—

1. Is there any such thing in existence as a revealed gospel?
2. How am I to know it?
3. Where shall I find it?
4. From whence did it originate?
5. What are the principle evidences of the truth and divine originality of such revelation?
6. What are the declared objects of such revelation to man?
7. To whom was the revelation made?
8. By what agency?
9. By whom was it first administered in the apostolic age?
10. To whom was it administered?
11. What were the peculiar effects of the gospel when administered?
12. What are the distinctive titles and characteristics given to the gospel?

These questions I can demonstrate by direct testimony from the Bible.

The above communication is from one of the eastern *luminaries* that shed their rays of light on the pages of the "Christian Palladium!" Campbell's theory! What is it? We listen. No statement! Yet, he informs his readers that "he has clearly appreciated the strength and weakness of Mr. Campbell's system of pretended ancient gospel!" Never mind, Mr. Crocker has discovered the "capital error." Hear him: "The leading error in Mr. Campbell's views is attributable to a want of proper distinction between the *former* revelation of the gospel *to the Apostles and Prophets*, and the former *administration* of that gospel by the Apostles to *others*." It seems that friend Crocker *first* became satisfied of the existence of error by witnessing the "bad influence" on the minds and lives of those who embraced it in the circle of *his* acquaintance! Why did not Mr. Crocker "point out" the *proper distinction* alluded to above? This is a great neglect on his part, to say no more; and then it would seem that he is the *very* man that ought to have done it—the *one* that the readers of the "Palladium" will expect to do it. He certainly is adequate to the task, from his recent knowledge of the Bible; for he informs his readers that "for more than two months past, he has given *nearly* his whole time to the study of the Bible, with a prayerful heart, comparing spiritual things with spiritual." It is true, this "attentive and prayerful" student of the Bible contends that "a divine power or influence was just as necessarily to be exerted in their administering the gospel to others as in the revelation of it to the Apostles, and in their confirming the truth and divine originality of the gospel by mighty signs and wonders." No distinction at all, I suppose! One thing I am fully convinced of—which is, that the day is at hand, "even at the door,"

Digitized by Google

when many who profess to be *Christian Ministers*, will find it agreeable if not convenient to dispense with many of the positive commands or institutions of the gospel. Mr. Crocker says, "When it is fairly shown what are the effects produced by the true gospel at the present day, when duly administered, what will then remain to be accomplished by baptism and other *external ceremonies*, will be fully realized by every humble inquirer." The above language is too plain to be misunderstood, and too pointed not to be felt. Take away what men contemptuously or blasphemously call *externals*, and then how are sinners to obtain a "remission of sins"? how are disciples to prove their discipleship? Why does Mr. C. represent certain doctrines as "vipers gnawing at the vitals of christianity"? It would seem that there is a set of individuals conspiring to overthrow christianity altogether, at once, or by piecemeal! Such may expect ere long to gnaw their tongues for pain, if they do not reform!

ROBERT COOK.

Nottingoam, Harrison county, Ohio,
December 26, 1884.

CO-OPERATION.

CHRISTIAN reader, learn a parable from the Rothschilds.

"*The Rothschilds.*—It will doubtless be interesting to our readers, to know some particulars of the lives of this remarkable family, who, by their enormous wealth, have so vast an influence over public affairs in Europe. We learn from the London Metropolitan, that the financial business of the house of Rothschild began to assume importance, in consequence of its first loan of ten millions of florins to the court of Denmark. In 1812, Mayer Anselmo Rothschild, the father, was attacked by a mortal illness. Aware of his approaching end, he had his ten children called to his bedside, gave them his dying benediction, and made them promise never to change their religion, and always to remain united among themselves on 'Change. These promises have been religiously kept, and amply has the fable of the bundle of sticks been verified by the five brothers.

Their great political operations commenced in 1813, and up to the present time it is computed that their house has negotiated, in loans, subsidies, &c., upwards of 160,000 millions sterling, principally for the different monarchs of Europe. Their profits, of course, have been immense.

For several years they have resided at a distance from each other, but this makes no difference in the unanimity of their operations. The *statistique* of the wondrous Five is as follows:

Anselmo, the eldest, who is 61 years of age, resides at Frankfort-on-the-Maine. At his house the general inventory is made out, from the private inventories furnished by the other four brothers. It is there also that the congresses of the fraternity are generally held.

Solomon, the second brother, aged 60, passes his professional time between Berlin and Vienna, chiefly at the latter.

Nathan, the third brother, aged 56, is the London Rothschild.

Charles, the fourth of the five bankers, 46 years old, resides at Naples.

Jacob, the youngest, aged 42, carries on business at Paris."

Now if christians were as prudent in conducting their affairs as these fleshly sons of Abraham, and if they would perseveringly use the ways and means of doing good, which Jesus Christ has conferred upon them, how vast would be their influence! Its swelling waves would break in blessings on every shore, and gladden all the coasts of the earth.

Ed. M. H.

Digitized by Google

Education---No. 3.

Dear brother Campbell,

SINCE writing to you a few days ago, I have been thinking upon a subject on which I wrote you a month or two since—that of education. A *reform* here, religious and literary, would, I think, do much good; in preparing the minds of the rising generation for the reception of the true principles of the christian religion; in fortifying them against the delusions of error, and religious enthusiasm and fanaticism; in putting them on their guard against false and destructive doctrines, by enabling them to discriminate between truth and error; and by imparting to them that *independence* in thinking and acting, without which all the teaching in the world will avail but little. When I say *independence*, I would distinguish between that and what is very often termed "free-thinking," of which *infidels* are in the habit of boasting so much; and also that licentiousness in thinking and acting in which *profligates* pride themselves. I would advocate that independence which, stopping short of the boundaries of *experience* or *facts* and *testimony*, never transcends them, but makes them its guides and the barriers to restrain and govern it. The system of Lord Bacon, when carried out fully and completely, and applied to all the branches of science and knowledge, is admirably calculated to give this independence to the mind. *Induction* and *illustration* should be two of the grand or governing principles in the plan of education pursued by every teacher. Nothing contributes so much towards fostering a true independence of mind, as teaching it to draw its own conclusions correctly, and to rest upon them when drawn, and carry them out into practice. When all is *certainty* there is but little room left for *doubt*, *conjecture*, or *scepticism*. The *analogical* method of reasoning would also be beneficial as far as it is compatible with the *Baconian method. Much the same course of education should be pursued with the mind as with the body—in training the mental faculties, as in training the physical powers. In teaching the child to walk, we only assist or help it enough to enable it to depend upon using its limbs itself when they are strong enough to bear its weight, and to carry the body along. We only give it such assistance as will enable it to do every thing itself well and correctly, and then leave it to perform its own actions. It should be thus with the mind. The abject servility of mind which we too generally witness in our country, particularly in religious matters, is truly deplorable. As evidence; when a person or a few persons in a family adopt certain religious tenets or sentiments, all the rest generally blindly and implicitly follow, no matter how absurd and degrading, how inconsistent with revelation, reason, and every thing else. It is the same case also in communities. Nothing is more common than to see

*See Lord Chancellor Brougham's account of the *Novum Organum* of Bacon, the first part of which is published in the first volume of the "American Library of Useful Knowledge."

Digitized by Google

whole families or whole communities all becoming Methodists, Baptists, or Presbyterians. The above plan of education and a more general diffusion of useful knowledge by making the people more intellgent, would go far towards remedying this. Particularly should children be brought up in the "nurture and admonition of the Lord." This plan of education would also do much towards destroying that undue reverence for great names and their authority, and long established doctrines and customs, which is among the means which prostrate and degrade the understanding; and also that authority which the concurrence of numbers is too apt to give to error. I would like to see you devote some attention to the subject of education in the Harbinger for next year; and also to point out what method, and studies, and course of reading are the best.

J. R. H.

We have not had leisure to prepare an article on education for the present number, and therefore present the above letter as containing some valuable thoughts upon the subject. ED.

Infidelity and Popery.

LEAVING the first principles of the reformation and the elements of ancient christianity as being fully developed in the works already offered to the public, we think the crisis demands that we turn our attention almost exclusively for some time to other themes, amongst which Infidelity, Popery, and Education occupy a prominent place. Three unclean spirits, antagonist to each other and the Bible, are daily becoming more and more bold and daring. These are the Papacy, Infidelity, and Sectarianism.

The Infidel and Papal Empires are assuming in this country a bold and daring attitude, ominous in appearance to the dearest and best interests of the whole community; and in accordance with the sentiments and wishes of many of our patrons, we feel it a duty pressing upon us to buckle on our armor, to unsheath the Sword of the Spirit, and most formally and solemnly to declare war against the Atheistic and Papal Spirits that are incessantly at work against the Bible and our civil liberties. In the spirit of the ancient witnesses, we would wage a good warfare, using only the sharp two-edged sword of the Spirit of Truth, and of a sound mind.

A few matters on hand disposed of, and we shall enter into the field and commence a new campaign under the banners of the Lord of hosts, against these two great belligerents that are daily defying the armies of the living God. We ardently desire the salvation of those with whom we propose to conflict; and while we will give them no quarters, it is because we desire to see them rescued from the snare of the devil. They may expect us to be controlled by all the laws of civilized warfare, and we will, in turn, demand from them the recognition of the same rules.

Digitized by Google

Courteous language and hard arguments are allowed by our King, and we intend to use only such weapons as he has promised to sustain and approve. But we shall more fully display our intentions as we proceed. EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

M'Minnville, T. November 30, 1834.

SINCE my last communication to you, six more in our neighborhood have made the good confession, and have been immersed for the remission of their sins. The young members appear to be very zealous in the cause of our Master, who has taken a journey, and will call his servants to a reckoning at his return. We want to have a zeal according to knowledge, that we may be able to do the Master's will, and hear the welcome plaudit when he returns. We are now congregated. Brother Carter has promised to travel next year. expect to devote a considerable portion of my time in proclaiming the word. I am to attend two appointments next week, for the first since I was taken sick. There is one thing that gives us here much satisfaction: it is, that those who have been immersed are of the most intelligent part of the community, and such as are calculated to do good to the cause of reformation.

ROBRRT G. SPICER.

Newsted, N. Y. December 12, 1834.

THE reformation still progresses with rapidity. In the bonnds of my travels, since my last, September 23, there have been 103 immersed, 39 of these were immersed in Canada, in the vicinity of brother Green; 9 of them while I was there, one of whom, J. Radcliffe, ex-editor of the Coburg Reformer. He is a man of talent and of literature, and bids fair to do much for the cause of reform in Canada. Twenty-one more of the above number were also immersed in Canada, west of Niagara river, on a late visit there by brother Thomas, brother Wilcox, and myself, the remainder in this state, west of the Genesee river.

J. J. MOSS.

Felicity, O. January 7, 1835.

I HAVE recently returned from a tour to Indiana and Illinois. Truth is, indeed, prevailing. My tour was laborious. In 39 days I spoke as many times to very respectable congregations, and had the pleasure of introducing into the kingdom of God's dear Son some in Oxford, Ohio; Indianapolis, Indiana; Rockville and York, Illinois. Great caution was manifested by the sects in getting up opposition meetings to prevent their priest-ridden flocks from hearing the truth. Curiosity, however, would bring them to the water, and be assured we there improved the opportunity.

A. KNOWLES.

May's Lick, Ky. January 7, 1835.

ABOUT two months since brother John O'Kane, from Connersville, Ind. came to this county, and remained about three weeks, during which time he visited and preached at most of the public places in the county. About fifty persons were induced to obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. We were then visited by brother John Rodgers, of Carlisle, Ky. who, in union with brother Richard Rickets of this county, induced about twenty others to confess the name of the Lord Jesus. Brother O'Kane returned to this county again about the first of last month, and will, we expect, remain some months in this

Digitized by Google

county. Already about one hundred persons have been induced to confess their faith in Jesus as the Son of God, and put him on by being immersed into his holy name for salvation, all in this county, up to the first of the new year. Add to the above number eighteen persons (during the same time) who were induced to obey the gospel over at Red Oak and Georgetown, in Brown county, Ohio, on two visits by our brother Rickets. Prospects are flattering for a greater increase. About fifty of the above named were added to the disciples at May's Lick. Thanks and praise be to our heavenly Father for his goodness and mercy to the children of men! Some of our dear relatives, friends, and acquaintances have been induced to obey the Saviour of sinners, and are now rejoicing in the good hope of eternal life. Among the happy number is my dear daughter, now in her 14th year. The hearts of many of our brethren and sisters are filled with joy and rejoicing to see and hear their companions, their children, their brothers, and sisters, and friends confessing their faith in the Lord Jesus, and bowing to his mild sceptre. A good number of those lately added are quite young in years—say from 13 years old and upwards. O may the good Lord grant that the number of the faithful may be greatly increased and increasing throughout the whole earth; and to His name be all the praise! Amen!

The opposition here seems to be more bitter and malignant than at any former period. Many false and malignant tales are circulated; but all will not do. They cannot stop the progress of the word of God. Free salvation is still being proclaimed here. Jesus has said, "Whoever will, let him come and take of the water of life freely;" also, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Blessed be his holy name for *this!*

It is said that one of our opponents recently said in his public address, that he could wish that the words or command given by *Peter* on the day of Pentecost, viz. "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins," especially the last clause, were out of the book. O what a pity! May all such repent of all such wickedness. I must now close the; mail is waiting. May grace, mercy, and peace be with you and all who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity!

ASA R. RUNYAN.

ADAMS COUNTY, Ill. January 17, 1835.

Brother Campbell—Having seen some time since your request to the brethren for information relative to the progress they were making in the Redeemer's kingdom, I think it is my duty to drop you a few lines on that subject; but first suffer me to give you a short history of my life since I have professed the christian religion. I was immersed about 13 years ago by brother J. Hulsey in the upper end of Jefferson county, Ky. and became a member of the church at Long Run. In a short time after, the church enjoined it on me to exercise a gift among them, (as they pleased to call it,) so that in about two years I was set apart by the church for ordination; at which time the church called in aid from several churches, so I had to pass the inspection of George Waller, James M'Quaid, Z. Carpenter, B. Allen, and J. Hulsey. At that time J. Hulsey was a member of Long Run, and as is common for Bishops, he objected to any partnership between us; but the church in defiance went on to ordain me. I continued my labors among the members of that church mostly for several years; and at length (the church being situate in a thickly inhabited country) the neighboring inhabitants began to make confession, or as it was then called, *get religion;* but so it was continued for some two or three years or until the church received somewhere between two and three hundred members. About this time the dangerous *ism* called *C—ism* began to be proclaimed among us, and I must confess that I felt alarmed; and when I first heard brother Allen on the subject of faith as a prerequisite to immersion, his views were so contrary to what I had been taught, that my blood seemed almost to chill within my veins; for there was no man living that I thought more of than B. Allen. But notwithstanding my great love for him, I opposed his views publicly, which uni-

Digitized by Google

versally wounded my feelings; consequently I determined to go into the investigation of the subjects of faith and the operation of the Spirit by reading or searching the Scriptures, without the aid of any concordance whatever; and to my great astonishment, I could not find that the Spirit was promised to any unbeliever, at least since the gospel era. This set me to arranging, or rather using the scriptures already arranged, which plainly show that testimony was necessary in order to faith, and that faith must be operative or productive of the fruits of the gospel or Spirit. Consequently the investigation led me to pursue a different course to that I formerly followed, which brought down persecution, hatred, and calumny from many of my brethren. But, brother Campbell, I could not reconcile it to myself at that time to use harsh measures with any of my old brethren, knowing that I had just been in a similar situation with them. I therefore labored hard for keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, telling them when assembled, that there was no necessity for a separation. But the Clergy (may the good Lord have mercy on them!) would not be satisfied till a number of churches were rent asunder. This wounded my feelings to such an extent that I had but little enjoyment among my brethren; and being somewhat unsettled in Kentucky, I determined to sell out and remove to this state, where I thought I could live in peace. But to my surprise, I soon met with opposition; and here I have to use the sword of the Spirit alone, or nearly so. I sometimes have brother J. Bowles, formerly of Kentucky, to help me; but it is but seldom.

After my arrival in Adams county, I began to inquire among the people for Baptists. I soon found about eleven in number, including myself and wife, who unanimously agreed that they were willing to go into a constitution upon the foundation of the Apostles, Prophets, and Jesus Christ; which was done or entered into on the 2d Lord's day in July, 1831. The summer following I immersed 25 or 30, as near as I now can recollect, upon the profession of their faith—not in any *ism*, but in Jesus Christ. Since that time we have received one by letter, and two immersed last summer, which makes our number at present about 50. We are living in peace among ourselves, though considerably scattered, being in a new country; and notwithstanding the opposition from the sects, the people will crowd our meetings. I think the prospect is good in this section of the country in favor of the reformation, provided we had more proclaimers of the gospel of Jesus Christ. As I possess a very delicate constitution, and much to attend to, being in a new country, with the charge of a large family, I have but little time to devote to the proclamation of the word out of the bounds of our little congregation, the labor of our evangelizing brethren will be gladly received among us.

JOHN B. CURL.

WELCH ANECDOTE.

A WELSH clergyman invited to assist in ordination of a minister in some part of England, was appointed to deliver the address to the church and congregation; and having been informed that their previous minister had suffered much from pecuniary embarrassment, although the church was fully able to support him comfortably—took the following singular method of administering reproof.

In his address to the church, he remarked, "You have been praying, no doubt, that God would send you a man after his own heart, to be your pastor. You have done well. God, we hope, has heard your prayer, and given you such a minister as he approves, who will go in and out before you, and feed your souls with the bread of life. But now you have prayed for a minister, and God has given you one to your mind, you have something more to do—you must take care of him; and in order to his being happy amongst you, I have been thinking you have to pray again. "Pray again! pray again! what

Digitized by Google

should we pray again for?" Well—I think you have need to pray again. "But for what?" Why I'll tell you. Pray that God would put Jacob's ladder down to earth again. "Jacob's ladder! Jacob's ladder! What has Jacob's ladder to do with our minister?" Why I think if God would put Jacob's ladder down, that your minister could go up into heaven on the Sabbath evening, after preaching, and remain all the week; then he could come down every Sabbath morning, so spiritually minded and so full of heaven, that he would preach to you almost like an angel. "O yes, that may be all very well, and if it was possible we should like it; but then we need our minister with us during the week, to attend prayer meetings, visit the sick, hear experience, give advice, &c. &c. and therefore must have him always with us; we want the whole of his time and attention." That may be, and I will admit the necessity of his daily attention to your concerns; but then you will remember, that if he remains here, he must have bread and cheese; and I have been told that your former minister was often wanting the common necessaries of life, while many of you can enjoy its luxuries; and therefore, I thought if God would put Jacob's ladder down, your present minister might preach to you on the Sabbath; and by going up into heaven after the service of the day, save you the painful necessity of supporting him.

Notice.

IN pursuance of an agreement entered into with brother *Campbell*, for reducing, as soon as possible, the price of the new version of the LIVING ORACLES, we have concluded to commence at the reduced price, and to retail it at 37½ cents per copy; and as we can bind the Testament and Hymn-Book in one volume at less cost than in two, and as it is more convenient to carry to meeting one volume than two, we have resolved to sell them neatly bound together at 62½ cents.

We have also concluded to republish the FAMILY TESTAMENT, with the accompanying Maps, Notes, and Tables, on the same type and on paper superior to the last edition—to have it bound neatly and substantially, and retailed at $1,50, as soon as suitable encouragement shall have been received.

Regarding the circulation of these works as of great importance to the advancement of the knowledge of the christian institution and the progress of the reformation, we design to be at all possible pains to furnish them equal to the demand—executed in good style, and on the most reasonable terms.

The following shall be our retail prices:—

Family Testament,	$1,50
Christianity Restored,	1,00
Owen Debate,	1,50
Walker do.	75
M'Calla do.	75
Begg, on the Prophecies,	75

Any of these works, extra bound, will be sold as much higher as will pay the extra expense.

At these reduced prices we shall expect prompt payments, and shall happy to fill all orders as soon as they arrive. Arrangements are being made to keep a constant supply in the following cities; to which places, owing to the facilities of sending by country merchants, who frequently visit them, those in remote places can be furnished:—Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Richmond, Washington city, Fayetteville, Charleston, Savanna, Mobile, Orleans, Natchez, Little Rock, Memphis, St. Louis, Nashville, Tuscumbia, Lexington, Louisville, Vincennes, Madison, Cincinnati, Maysville, Portsmouth, Marietta, Wheeling, Pittsburg, Columbus, Cleaveland, and Buffaloe. In all these cities agents will be announced as soon as possible. M'VAY & EWING

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number IV.——Volume VI.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. April, 1835.

The Millennium---No. 8.

NO person who believes the Lord Jesus when he forewarned *Peter*, probably with a reference also to his pretended successor, that "all who take the sword *shall perish by the sword*;" or who has the slightest acquaintance with prophecy, can doubt but that the *sword* shall act a conspicuous part in the future acts of the prophetic drama. The Lord will "bath his sword in the heavens," his sword shall "devour much flesh," the sword shall "be filled with blood;" out of the wine press blood flowed in a current deep as the reined horse could wade, even at the distance of sixteen hundred furlongs, or two hundred miles from the city of blood. Bold as these figures are, they have their foundation in solemn reality.

But the question is, Who will shed this blood? Will the saints? will the angels? will the Lord himself in person?! Nay, verily—God "has prepared the wicked for the day of evil"—the men of blood for a bloody work. The wicked Cyrus was for this reason called the Lord's *anointed*. "I have surnamed thee, though thou carest not for me"—"I will open for him the two-leaved gates"—"He shall with the sword enter the palace of Babylon."

But again we must ask, Who will shed this blood? When the Lord has a dirty job, there is no want of dirty undertakers. When "the harvest of the earth is ripe," the angel that sits on the cloud has his sharp sickle, waiting for the word. "He that sat upon the cloud," at the word of command, "put forth his sickle on the earth, and the earth was reaped." It is not a matter of idle curiosity to which we invite the thoughtful, when we put the question, Who or what people will be the instruments of this awful carnage?

Let us, then, survey the parties in the field. They are three—the Lord's party, the harlot's party, the infidel party;—the christian

Digitized by Google

power, the papal power, the infidel power; and in the day of the earthquake, when the Gentile establishments fall to the ground within the great city, (i. e. its *territory*,) will be found three parties; for in the earthquake the city fell into *three parts*.

No commentator has hitherto been able to interpret the *three parts* into which the great city Babylon fell under the seventh vial. Too many of them regard the earthquake as the work of a day—an hour. But it will be a woeful long hour. The geography of the earthquake is not the city of seven hills alone—it is not Italy, nor Spain, nor France, nor Germany alone—it includes the whole territory of the beast with seven heads and ten horns—the whole waters on which the woman sat—the people, the nations, the languages, that supported the beast, and the false prophet. Within its territory are now *three powers*, but not fallen into three *separate masses*. The infidel power, as the Popes of the nineteenth century all lament, is growing with herculean vigor, and is already of gigantic strength. It has spread over France, over England, over Germany, over all the political states of Europe. It is rife, even in Northern, in Southern, and Central America. Wherever the Pope spreads his sable wings, the owls and bats multiply and increase. Infidelity now outgrows the papacy. It is latent in Rome and rampant in France; it mutters in Spain and rages in Germany; it appears in the twilight in the Old World, and courts the day in all the New. It is a great and growing power; *and while Popery reigns upon the thrones of Europe and sects increase in Protestant countries, it will outgrow every other* ISM—*Protestantism and Catholicism*.

Infidels are the militant sons of hierarchies—are the eagles of war. These are the men of blood. Inquisitions and guillotines are the Apostles of these two great sects. They are all men of blood, and their hatred of each other grows like the corn and flourishes like the vine. Such is the fact; and such from an invincible necessity must be the belligerents in the last great war. Christians cannot fight with swords of steel. They cannot rejoice in blood. They cannot, therefore, be the sword in the hand of God to avenge his quarrel, his great controversy with apostate christendom. But they will not be wholly a neutral party. They will fight with the sword of the Spirit—they will use the sharp two-edged sword that proceeds out of the mouth of *the Faithful and True Witness*. They may be regarded by both parties as an enemy, and may in the general conflict between the antagonist principles of democracy and papacy, suffer a persecution even unto death. But certain it is they cannot be a party in the great conflict which is to leave the harlot desolate and naked—eat her flesh and burn her with fire.

But the fates of the antichristian kings, the ten-horned beast, and the fates of the false prophet, are to be identical and contemporaneous. The beast and the false prophet, the monarchies and hierarchies allied in corruption and tyranny, shall be allied in their fates. They shall be both *cast alive into a lake of fire*. The *flesh* of *kings*, of *captains*, of mighty men, of all men, free and bond, small and great,

Digitized by Google

allied to the beast and the false prophet, are to be served up together at the great supper of the Lord God Almighty. The officers of the new government that shall succeed the present allied monarchies, aristocracies, and hierarchies, shall, by the order of the *new King*, the rightful Sovereign of the new heavens and the new earth, divide the riches of both the ecclesiastic and political chiefs of the kingdom of the little horn, and distribute them amongst the friends of the new order of things which shall then succeed the tyrannies of the former systems.

It requires, then, only a reasonable acquaintance with the prophetic style to solve the difficulty suggested in our last essay, growing out of the contemporaneous ruin of the beast and the false prophet; or, rather, out of the predicted sorrows and sympathies of certain chiefs, expressed on the fall of Babylon, and the agency which the old kingdoms and former supporters of the harlot shall have in her destruction.

There is nothing incongruous in supposing that the governments once under the tyranny of the little horn, may throw off their allegiance under the influence of infidelity, and conspire to destroy that whole priesthood which has corrupted the whole earth. Nor is it incompatible that the harlot will make a desperate effort to sustain herself and call to her aid some of the kings of the earth; and that thus, under the pretext of a new and better government, essentially infidel in its principles—and the opposition of the priesthood, under the pretence of sustaining a divine institution, which indeed is the workmanship of their own evil passions—may be the occasion of the last great battle which shall forever decide the fates of democracy and the papacy, the ostensible parties in the great battle of Armageddon.

The *polemos*, or war of Armageddon, is not the single battle of a day. Megiddo, mentioned in the Jewish records,* was so famous for signal slaughters, that it became proverbial for a place of mourning and destruction. The holy alliance of confederated princes, actuated by the three unclean spirits of imposture and fraud, figured by the well-known symbol of *frogs*, shall go forth *among* the allied kings of the whole world to assemble them to the great day of God Almighty. Then will be the time of carnage, the day of destruction and of blood.

It is, then, in the heat of this tremendous conflict that the King of saints treads the winepress of the indignation and wrath of Almighty God, then is he clothed in a garment immersed in the blood of his enemies. "Who is this that comes from the land of Edom with dyed garments from Bozrah; glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to deliver. Why art thou red in thy apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth the winepress? I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in my anger and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment. For the day of vengeance is my heart, and the year of my redeemed has

* *Chron.* xxxv. 22. *Zechariah* xii. 11.

Digitized by Google

come. I will tread down the people in my anger, and make them drunk in my fury, and I will bring down their strength to the earth."*

Not a saint is with the King in this battle—"of all the people, not one was with him;" he makes his and their enemies execute upon one another his vengeance, and thus gives them blood to drink, for they are worthy: enough to justify the proposition that the end of the Man of Sin shall be with blood and desolation unparallelled in the annals of time.

The three spirits of false religion, of corrupt religion, and of no religion, in combination with the threefold lusts of despotism, will undoubtedly be the instigators of this tremendous carnage.

Thus the kings of the earth shall hate the harlot, make her desolate, eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. Her friends and allies, in some of the breathings of this fearful agony, may lament her fate, and display much sympathy with her in her appalling doom; but they too shall go with her to destruction: for the King of Kings with the rod of his anger shall strike to the heart the kings that took part with her; "he shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill the places with dead bodies, he shall wound the head over many countries."†

We have now before us the final doom of the ill-omened city. The Man of Sin lies weltering in his gore, and all earthly hierarchies are cast into the lake of fire. But this is done by the *brightness* of his coming.

It is not unworthy of notice that all the intimations of this catastrophe indicate a rapid spread of light and a large increase of knowledge anterior to its approach. John in his splendid visions is struck with admiring awe at the dazzling splendor of the descending angel, the harbinger of the fall of Babylon. He says, "I saw an angel descending from heaven, who had great power, and the earth was *enlightened by his glory.*" With a mighty voice he cries, It is fallen! It is fallen! Babylon the Great! The radiance of this angelic harbinger, enlightening the earth, only symbolizes the "many running to and fro" which Daniel saw, accumulating knowledge before the epoch of the last plagues.

During the period of the seventh trumpet the earth shall be enlightened with knowledge, scientific, political, and religious; and as Daubuz long ago affirmed, "on this depends the overthrow of Babylon." She arose in an age of darkness, and shall fall in and by the progress of light. The mighty revolutions of America and France are full of instruction on this subject. The progress of light is still advancing. The mind is not illuminated in a day. Nations cannot learn faster than the individuals of which they are composed. A part of Germany, in 1520, renounced the Pope; Denmark and Sweden, in 1525; and England, in 1534. So it may be expected while "many run to and fro and knowledge is increased." Error, tyranny, and despotism of every species, cannot endure the light. How natural, then, are the intimations of the Prophets! Daniel foretells an accumulation of

**Isaiah* lxi. 1—7. †*Psalm* cx.

Digitized by Google

knowledge before the time of the end; John sees an angel of the brightest effulgence illuminating the earth before the fall of the city; and Paul affirms that the destruction of the Man of Sin shall be consummated by the *brightness* of Messiah's coming. And Jesus says the gospel shall be announced in all the world for a witness to all nations before he strikes the fatal blow.

I have now, perhaps, Mr. Editor, occupied as many of your pages on this subject as is due to me; and, perhaps, though I have not counted, as many as our brother M'Corkle. As, therefore, I have sketched out, and only sketched another mode of interpretation than that of the literalists, and rather examined their system, than defended at full length my own, I think it due to the public and to my good lay brother to pause for a reply.

I have, indeed, aimed at the demolition of their system, and I need scarcely add that I have only addressed myself to their fundamental points, believing that if their leading conclusions are proved to be without sufficient premises, their system tumbles to the ground. I think enough has been said to create at least strong doubts in their most prominent positions and modes of reasoning; and if they cannot be speedily repaired and fortified by some new arguments and developments, we will expect a magnanimous surrender of the keys of the city.

I trust, without boasting, I may be permitted to say, that I have much in reserve, which I think it would be injudicious to offer until my brethren, who may differ from me, shall have had an opportunity of being heard. It remains for you, Mr. Editor, to say whether it is better to have one essay now in turn, or a whole series on each side. I approved your hints in a former No. to our layman, on the propriety of selecting some of his principal points, and concentrating his forces in support of them. I presumed it to be a typographical error when you referred him to the 6*th* of my essays, rather than to the 8 numbers* which I promised you on the chief points at issue. If I might add any thing to what you have hinted in that note, I would express a wish that brother M'Corkle may in the most judicious manner defend his system which I have attacked, in the essential points on which we have most expatiated—not, indeed, for the sake of victory, but for the sake of truth. I shall be much gratified to see him either sustain himself with an evidence that commands acquiescence, or yield to a more scriptural and rational view of the prophecies. I would be as well pleased—nay, as much delighted, to be assured that Jesus will literally return to Jerusalem within twelve years, (in 1847,) as that he will not appear in person to the close of the Millennium. My hope is in the resurrection of the just. I promise myself no earthly Paradise, as I am too old and feeble to expect to reach the happy era of the literalists; and to me in *hades* it will not make the difference of an hour, whether the Messiah returns in ten or ten hundred years.

A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

**It is a typographical error—a* 6 *instead of an* 8.

Digitized by Google

Mistranslations---No. 3.

Gen. vi. 14. "Make thee an ark of *gopher wood.*" This is rather no translation at all; for it is the Hebrew word itself. The Septuagint seems not to have understood the nature or kind of the wood alluded to, and therefore render it *ek xuloon tetrayoonoon*, of "squared timber;" and the Vulgate, equally perplexed, render it *de lignis loevigatis*, "of planed timber." Bochart makes it probable at least, that the cypress wood is intended: for *gopher* is obviously the parent of the Greek *kupar*, the radix of *kuparissos*, translated *cypress*. Moreover, the ancients used cypress for ship-building.

Mistranslation, No. 5.—Gen. viii. 7. "He sent forth a raven, which went to and fro, until the waters were dried up from off the earth." Thus the raven was at least twenty-one days on the wing! The Hebrew original is *vaiyetse yatse veshob*, and fairly imports, "And it went forth (i. e. from the ark) going forth and returning" That the raven did return to the ark, though not again taken into it, is fairly implied in the Hebrew.

No. 6.—Gen. xi. 7. "Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech." The original word *habah* means *come.* All versions that we have seen, except the common, thus understand it. The Septuagint has *deute*, and the Vulgate *veniti*—"Come, let us go down."

Gen. xv. 2. "And the steward of my house is Eleazer of Damascus." *Meshek*, translated *steward*, seems to be a proper name. The Septuagint so regards it: "The son of Meshek my handmaid, this Eliezer of Damascus," is my heir. Eliezer appears to have been the son of a female, who, because of her parentage, was called a Damascene.

No. 7.—xx. 16. "And unto Sarah he said, Behold *I* have given thy brother a thousand pieces of silver. Behold, he is to thee a covering of the eyes—unto all that are with thee, and with all other. Thus she was reproved."

Much of the spirit and beauty of this reproof is lost in the common version. Let it be read as follows, and mark the difference: "Behold I have given thy *brother* a thousand pieces of silver: behold *it* (not *he*) is for thee a covering of the eyes, (to buy you a vail,) to all those who are with thee; and in every thing speak the truth," (i. e. the whole truth.)

On the passage, "*Thus was she reproved*," it has already been remarked by Dr. Clark that the original, *veno cachath*, the second person preterite is probably used here, as it often is, for the imperative. This is derived from *nacah*, "to make straight," "to speak rightly." The Septuagint thus understood it, and have rendered it *kai panta aleetheuson*, "and in all things speak the truth."

As if he had said, You have called Abraham your *brother*, call him your *husband* also; meanwhile accept the thousand didrachma, and make for yourself a veil to conceal and protect you from all that travel with you and from all others. The antecedent to the word *he*

Digitized by Google

is the one thousand shekels, and not *Abraham;* and therefore, not *he,* but *it* is the proper term.

Gen. xxi. 10. "Cast out the bondwoman and her son." *Garash* signifies not merely to cast out, but also to *divorce,* and is thus used Levit. xxi. 7. Sarah desired more from Abraham than to put Hagar out of doors. She had an eye to the inheritance; and as Ishmael might have had some right and title, because the son of Abraham, she wished to have his claims annulled by the divorcing of her mother.

Gen. xxii. 1. "And God did *tempt* Abraham"—did try Abraham. The Greeks use *epeirase*—did prove Abraham.

No. 8.—xxv. 8. "Then Abraham gave up the ghost." Our English word *ghost* is Angle-Saxon, (*gast,*) meaning an inmate, *guest,* casual visitant; also, sometimes a spirit. It has now come to denote invariably the human spirit. Now the question is, How did Abraham give up the ghost or spirit! It might have been more pertinent to our views that Abraham gave up the body; but how the body can give up the spirit is not so very obvious. A person might be tolerated in commending his spirit to God, but not in dismissing it from the body. Jesus Christ alone possessed that power: "I have power," said he, "to lay down my life, and power to resume it." Some of our greatest admirers of the common version dissent from it, not only in this passage, but also in many others of the same sort—indeed, in all others where this phrase occurs.

The original word in Gen. xxv. 8. is *yigevah,* from the root *gava,* to pant for breath, to expire, to breathe one's last. It ought, then, to read, 'Abraham expired'—he breathed out his last breath.

No. 9.—xxv. 17, 18. "And these are the years of the life of Ishmael, a hundred and thirty and seven years; and he gave up the ghost, and died, and was gathered to his people. And they dwelt from Havelah unto Shur, that is before Egypt, as thou goest towards Assyria; and he died in the presence of all his brethren."

We are sustained by Adam Clark in affirming that this is a mistranslation. He observes on the words, "He died in the presence of all his brethren," "In verse 17 it is said 'he gave up the ghost and died, and was gathered unto his people.' Then follows the account of the *district* occupied by the Ishmaelites; at the conclusion of which it is added, *al peney col achaiv naphal,* "it, (the lot or district) fell to him (or was divided) in the presence of all his brethren." And this was exactly agreeable to the promise of God, (chapter xvi. 12.) "He shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren." And to show that this promise had been strictly fulfilled, it is here remarked that his lot or inheritance was assigned by the Lord contiguous to that of the other branches of the family. The same word, *naphal,* is used Joshua xxiii. 4. for *to divide by lot.*"

EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

Education---No. 4.

NEWTON entered life without a single idea: so have all the men of all ages of time. Man has capacity or susceptibility from the hand of his Creator; no more. He is, therefore, passive before he can be active. He receives impressions before he makes them. That something we call *mind*, acts not till acted upon through the medium of the machinery of sense. The animal frame, the five senses, like the five mechanical powers, are but the machinery through which and by which the mind acts, and is acted upon. The material universe enters the soul, or acts upon the mind only by the medium of sense; and no other universe can enter the soul but through the material universe. So that the Great Spirit operates upon the human mind through the material universe.

The first impression is that of pain—the first action, complaint. Thus man in making his debut on the theatre of life, enters with a shriek. The child of agony, he agonizes on his first rencontre with the very elements of his existence. He feels before he thinks, and therefore his mind itself is stimulated into action. Thus man begins to learn.

But how does he learn? First, undoubtedly, by sensation, and then by reflection. But what is sensation, but *perception by the senses?* and what reflection, but *the act of looking back*, reading and comparing the records of memory? That something which perceives and reflects is different from the perception and the reflection, and still more different from that which is perceived and reflected upon. This percipient reflecting principle is what we call *the mind;* that intellectual something which is called the soul of man, on which impressions terminate as the rays of light upon the retina of the eye. All that makes the outward man are but the organs of his spirit, as the tongue is the organ of speech. The five senses, with all their appendages, all the members and parts of the animal frame, are but instruments by which the human spirit acquires the means of enjoyment, and of making for itself a character. The body, with all its marvellous systems and tissues, evidently exists for the interest and behoof of the mind, and not the mind for the body. Material nature for the body, and the body itself for its heaven-born guest within, is most unquestionably the order of nature, as far as pertains to this terraqueous globe with all its appurtenances. How precious, then, that gem deposited by the hand of God, with so much wisdom and care, within that splendid casket, framed with such wonderful contrivance and adorned with such manifold beauty!

So intimate the union and communion of body, soul, and spirit, that nought but the word of God can separate between the soul and spirit, and detect the thoughts, intents, and affections of the heart. Guided by that unerring word, the philosophy of nature, of matter and of mind, is easily learned, so far as it confers dignity, honor, and happiness on man. But without this infallible guide, nature is without

Digitized by Google

an interpreter; and therefore the Atheist is necessarily a fool. Indeed, as often as he attempts to learn nature, and to explore the recondite principles and reasons of things, he affirms that he is not wise enough to see God any where, nor an intelligent mind in all the upper or nether dominions of nature; and, like every other fool, he supposes himself wiser than all the world, because he believes nothing and knows not himself.

We have seen that the moment of birth is the entrance into the school of nature—that God has, by the first impression of the attributes of things upon the new born infant compelled it to begin to learn. Now if these first indications of the wisdom of God had been only accurately observed and undeviatingly practised upon ages before Bacon was born, the world would have been ages in advance of what it is now.

The fundamental principles of that science of education which I am now about to propose, I profess to have learned in the primary schools and colleges of nature. Mother Nature is not only the kindest, but the best qualified and most talented school mistress from the gates of the morning to the shades of death. *Her first effort is to arrest the attention of her pupil.* This she does by salting him with oxygen as soon as he enters her portico. She rouses his powers into action by making it his interest and his happiness to learn. She deals not in abstract essences and remote principles, but in all her concrete forms makes him feel and take an interest in all her instructions. She begins not with words, but with things; and she obtrudes things upon him by their sensible attributes, and thus approaches the inward man by the outward.

If men had followed her suggestions and imitated her examples, the accumulated experience of ages would at this time have filled the world with true science and true religion. But now we are as one that awakes from a confused dream. This generation may be compared to a man of 60 going to school to learn to read. Better *late* than *never*. Let us, then, all go to Mistress Nature and learn our a, b, c. One lesson in the day is enough, if it be well learned. The lesson for this day is, that in order to learn any thing, we must fix our attention upon it. Now let all those who instruct youth make it their first endeavor to teach their pupils how to command their own attention. By this means they will certainly learn, and become proficients—without it, they must live and die dunces.

To command the attention is the best of arts, as it is the first of the arts which Nature teaches. Nature's school is a school of arts and sciences; and while she teaches that science exists for art, even that of religion for the art of living happily—and that science must precede art; yet she begins, scientifically it is true, to teach her junior class the art of fixing their attention upon her lessons before she opens to them her primer.

In classifying her pupils in the senior class, she confers the first honor on those who have made the greatest progress in fixing and keeping their attention upon the lessons of the day: for this, she de-

Digitized by Google

clares, is the very basis of all that is called talent, or genius, or greatness amongst men. No person ever learned any thing but by fixing his attention upon it; and he that makes this his strongest habit, inevitably becomes the greatest man—admitting only that his spirit has obtained a well ordered set of instruments by which to operate in the magazines of nature.

Now, my youthful reader, if you have learned this lesson from this essay, and will practise and improve upon it, I am sure you will be six months, at least, in advance of all your classmates, who have never been thus introduced to Mother Nature. EDITOR.

Religious Magazine.

PREPARATORY to our new series on the *reasons* of our faith and hope in God, we present our readers, from the Religious Magazine, a brief view of Mahometanism, Judaism, and Christianity, as at present existing in the world. This religious magazine is edited by *Origen Bachelor*, of New York, who so successfully combatted the "Free Inquirer," or *Robert Dale Owen*, then its principal Editor. Mr. Bachelor's Religious Magazine, of 64 imperial octavo pages per month, at 3 dollars per annum, promises to be a very valuable publication; and from the editorial talents of the Editor, displayed in the "Family Magazine," will, no doubt, obtain an extensive circulation. The following sketch from its Prospectus intimates a wide, extensive, and useful range:—

"It is a work designed for circulation not merely among the religious, but among all whom the subject of religion concerns—the whole community. That it may be adapted to this promiscuous circulation, we shall give it so general and wide a scope in its subjects, as to enable us to furnish matter adapted to the cases of all; in doing which, we shall give a kind of system of religious knowledge. We shall treat on natural theology, revealed religion, scripture doctrines, biblical literature, sacred geography, and antiquities, ecclesiastical history, religious biography, and the various religions of mankind; together with such additional subjects as may be considered standard branches of religious knowledge. We shall admit the candid discussion of those religious points on which evangelical christians differ; also, of those moral questions on which there is a difference of opinion. We shall furnish a religious miscellany, a summary of religious intelligence, and a good piece of music in each number, adapted to the purposes of devotion. All subjects admitting of illustration and embellishment by means of engravings, will be illustrated and embellished accordingly."

We wish the Editor all success in diffusing useful knowledge.

Ed. M. H.

MAHOMETANISM.

Mahometanism, or Islamism, is the religion founded upon the Koran of Mahomet. It may be considered a mixture of Judaism and Chris-

Digitized by Google

tianity, with some fanciful embellishments. Mahometans are divided into two sects, those of Omar and Ali. The former prevails in Turkey and Arabia, the latter in Persia. There is a fixed hostility between these two divisions of Mahometan faith. Absurd, false, and sensual as is this religion, it yet exerts its influence over at least 100,000,000 of people, among whom are the inhabitants of Turkey, Arabia, Persia, Tartary, and the northern and eastern parts of Africa. There is reason to believe, however, that the Mahometan religion, at the present time, is rapidly declining with the decline of power in those nations who have hitherto sustained it.

This vast company of religious professors take their name from Mahomet, who was born at Mecca, a city in Arabia Felix, in 571. The circumstances of Mahomet's early life were such as presented no flattering prospects of grandeur, and no probable views of ambition to his future life. He was illiterate, obscure, and very poor, till he married Cadigha, a widow of considerable property, for whom he had acted, for a number of years, as a mercantile agent, so much to her satisfaction, that she in return gave him the command of her property and person. This alliance, which took place in the 25th year of his age, raised him to an equality with the richest citizens in Mecca, and laid the foundation of his future fortune; and from this period, it is supposed, he began to meditate those schemes which raised him to eminence and power.

Character of Mahomet.—This is differently represented by different writers. His followers of course consider him as the model of perfection, and as superior to all other men who ever lived upon the earth; as the chosen and favored instrument of God for the greatest good to mankind. Some describe him as a man of the most consummate policy, and possessing the most fertile genius for fixing on auxiliaries for the accomplishment of his ambitious designs. Others represent him as a wild enthusiast, whose claims to celestial visions were like those of many hair-brained pretenders whose schemes have fallen into oblivion, for the want of those favorable conjunctures which led on the Arabian Prophet to authority and fame. Mahomet was undoubtedly a man of penetration and sagacity, and was thoroughly versed in all the arts of insinuation and intrigue. He made a fine personal appearance, and was fond of being thought to look like Abraham; was liberal to the poor, courteous to his equals, and condescending to his inferiors. He is said to have been a person of few words, of an equal, cheerful temper, and very pleasant and familiar to his friends. As to learning he had none, but this he turned to a useful account, by insisting that the writings he produced as revelations from God, could not possibly be a forgery of his own. And his followers also, instead of being ashamed of their master's ignorance of literature, gloried in it as an evident proof of his divine mission, and scrupled not to call him *the illiterate Prophet.*

His fondness for women, by his own confession, was beyond all bounds of moderation, and his many salvos in his Koran for his concupiscence and concubinage, are disgusting to every virtuous mind.

Digitized by Google

The multiplication of his wives, and his fond dalliance with female disciples, settled down, in his later years, into a sensual grossness, which, whatever may be said of the polygamy of the times, was altogether incompatible with that sainted eminence and celestial unction of which he made such perpetual and ridiculous boasts.

Mahomet limited his followers to the number of four wives—with the liberty of keeping as many concubines as they could maintain; while he himself married fifteen, or, as others say, twenty-one wives, besides having concubines. Of these, five died before him, six he repudiated, and ten were alive at his death. But his having this number of women was in consequence of a divine indulgence with which a God of infinite purity and justice, according to his account, had favored him.

Origin and Character of the Koran.—It was not till Mahomet was forty years old, that he took upon him the title of the Apostle of God, and began to publish the revelations which, according to his account, were communicated to him from heaven by the angel Gabriel.—These celestial communications Gabriel continued to make to him for the space of twenty-three years, directly from the archives of heaven, where the originals were deposited. They were placed in the chest of his Apostleship; and from this mass of revelations the Koran was compiled after Mahomet's death, by Abubecker, one of his earliest and most illustrious disciples. This is the Mahometan account of the origin of the Koran; but others say, that instead of writing the chapters of this famous book by the dictation of Gabriel, he was assisted in their composition by a *Persian Jew* and a *Christian Monk*, by whose aid he acquired such an extensive knowledge of the Jewish and Christian religions.

The Koran is a mixture of seriousness and levity; of moral precepts and ceremonial details; of sublime descriptions of the character of God, and of the most grovelling and frivolous illustrations of the duty of man: in one passage we read of the exalted attributes of Jehovah, and of the terrors of the day of judgment; and in the next we meet with some ridiculous and offensive directions for musselmen to adjust collisions among their concubines and wives. Well might Gibbon say of the Mahometan Oracles, that "they sometimes crawl in the dust, and at other times are lost in the clouds."

The professed object of the Koran was to replant the true and ancient religion professed by Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and all the Prophets; to destroy the idolatry of the Pagan Arabs, and the superstitions of Jews and Christians. A mixture of all these religions are discoverable in this book. Much is said in it of the principal characters and events contained in the Scriptures; but both Jews and Christians are called idolators; the Patriarchs and Apostles, according to the Koran, were Mahometans; the angels worshipped Adam; and the fallen angels were driven from heaven for not doing so; Christ was neither God nor the Son of God, and assured Mahomet of this in a conference with the Almighty and himself; and it furthermore asserts that Christ was not crucified on Mount Cal-

Digitized by Google

vary, when he appeared to suffer, but that another person was crucified in his stead, while God took him to himself.

Doctrines of the Koran.—The two grand principles of the Mahometan religion are the *unity* of God, and the divine mission of Mahomet. *There is no God but God, and Mahomet is his Prophet,* are familiar sayings among this people; idolatry and image worship of every kind are offensive to them; they made awful havoc with the temples of the heathen gods, and all the trumpery of paganism wherever they carried their victorious arms. The Catholics have ever found them subtle and difficult opponents on account of the show of image worship in their religious rites. The doctrine of the Trinity the Mahometans reject in terms of the greatest disdain, being forbidden in a number of places in the Koran to believe it. The doctrine of predestination they carry to a downright fatalism, and the merit of good works, on the other hand, they magnify in the highest strains.

According to the Koran, Paradise is adorned with every thing costly and magnificent—there the faithful shall enjoy the most beautiful women who shall not cast an eye on any but themselves, with whom they shall enjoy the continual pleasures of love to all eternity; they shall drink the most delicious liquors, and the most pleasant wines. There will not only be marriage, but servitude in the next world, and the very meanest in Paradise will have eighty thousand servants, and seventy-two wives of a celestial kind, besides the wives he had in this world: he will have a tent erected for him of pearls, hyacinths, and emeralds. And to crown the whole, if the faithful in Paradise are desirous of issue, it shall be conceived, born, and grow up in the space of an hour. These are a few of the descriptions of the joys of that Paradise to which the millions of Mahometans look forward with the utmost confidence and delight.

Spread of the Mahometan Religion.—This at first was effected by argument and persuasion; but after the Prophet arrived at power, these gentle methods were exchanged for those of conquest and war. And the terror of his arms, together with the fascinating allurements of the fancied Paradise of the Koran, conspired to give the most unexampled rapidity to the spread of the new religion; so that in less than a century, Mahomet and his succeeding Generals had subdued a far greater extent of territory than the Romans conquered in eight hundred years.

In addition to the agreeableness of his doctrines to the corrupt propensities of human nature, this warlike Prophet taught his followers that "a drop of blood shed in the cause of God, or a night spent in arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting and prayer. Whosoever falls in battle, his sins are forgiven at the day of judgment; his wounds shall be as resplendent as vermillion, and odoriferous as musk; and the loss of his limbs shall be supplied by wings of angels and cherubim."

The first disciples of Mahomet were called Saracens, and among them were some of the most famous warriors in the world.

Digitized by Google

Mahometanism distributes itself into two general parts—faith and practice: the former contains six branches, viz. belief in God; in his angels; in his Scriptures; in his Prophets; in the resurrection and final judgment, and the divine decrees. In the second part are included prayer with washing, alms, fasting, pilgrimage to Mecca, and circumcision. Among the negative precepts of this religion, are the prohibitions of wine, by which are meant all strong drinks, gaming, usury, the eating of blood and swine's flesh, and whatever dies of itself, &c. &c.

Friday is observed by the Mahometans as their Sabbath, because they believe it was on that day that Mahomet fled from Mecca to Medina.

They defer the circumcision of their children till they can distinctly pronounce the two leading articles of their faith—"There is no God but God, and Mahomet is his Prophet;" or till any convenient time between the age of 6 and 16.

The Mahometans have an established priesthood and a numerous body of clergymen; their spiritual head in Turkey, whose power is not inferior to the Roman Pontiff, is regarded as the oracle of sanctity and wisdom. Their houses of worship are denominated mosques, many of which are very magnificent, and very richly endowed.

The Mahometan priests who perform the rites of their public worship are called *Imams*; and they have a set of ministers called Shekhs, who preach every *Friday*, much in the manner of Christian preachers.

The Mahometans, like the Christians, are divided and subdivided into many sects and parties; but the two leading sects are the Sonnites and Schiites, who, notwithstanding they both believe in the Prophet and his religion, yet anathematize each other as abominable heretics, and as farther from the truth than either Christians or Jews. The Schiites are the followers of Ali, who reside chiefly in Persia; the Sonnites are the disciples of Abubeker, among whom are the Turks, Arabians, &c.

This religion obliges its disciples to pray five times a-day, and imposes upon them a burdensome ritual, which all devout Mussulmen scrupulously observe. They are obliged to fast the whole of the month *Ramadan* or *Ramazan*, from early in the morning until the evening twilight.

JUDAISM.

Judaism is the religion of the Jews, and is divided into two sects, the Karaites, who acknowledge as divine only the books of the Old Testament; and the Rabbinnists, who attribute an authority almost divine to the collection known under the name of the Talmud. The Jews are scattered throughout Europe, and many parts of Asia, Africa, and America. Their whole number is supposed to be about 3,000,000.

As this persecuted race, who were formerly continually wasted and destroyed, have lived in a state of tranquility for a century past, some writers suppose their present number at six or seven millions.

Digitized by Google

This people constitute one of the most singular and interesting portions of mankind; for about three thousand years they have existed as a distinct nation, and what is remarkable, by far the greatest part of this time they have been in bondage and captivity.

The calling of Abraham, the father and founder of this nation; the the legislation of Moses; the priesthood of Aaron; the Egyptian bondage; the conquest of Canaan; the history of the Jews to the coming of the Messiah; and their cruel and injurious treatment of this august and innocent personage, are facts which the Scriptures disclose, and with which it is presumed every reader is well acquainted.

The siege and destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, the Roman General, was one of the most awful and distressing scenes that mortals ever witnessed, and the details, as given by Josephus, are enough to make humanity shudder. During the siege, which lasted nearly five months, upwards of eleven hundred thousand Jews perished; John and Simon, the two Generals of the Hebrews, who were accounted the ringleaders of the rebellious nation, with seven hundred of the most beautiful and vigorous of the Jewish youth, were reserved to attend the victors' triumphal chariot. The number taken captive during this fatal contest, amounted to ninety-seven thousand; many of whom were sent into Syria and the other provinces to be exposed in public theatres to fight like gladiators, or to be devoured by wild beasts. The number of those destroyed in the whole war, of which the taking of the holy city was the bloody and tremendous consummation, is computed to have been one million four hundred and sixty thousand.

For about eighteen hundred years, this wonderful people have maintained their peculiarities of religion, language, and domestic habits, among Pagans, Mahometans, and Christians; and have suffered a continued series of reproaches, privations, and miseries, which have excited the admiration and astonishment of all who have reflected on their condition.

False Messiahs.—The constant and fond expectations of the Jews of a coming Messiah, who shall deliver them from bondage and captivity, and lead them in triumph to the land of Canaan, their ancient favorite abode, has involved them in a succession of the grossest impositions, and most calamitous disappointments. An account of all the false Messiahs since the true one was cruelly and wickedly rejected, would fill a volume. The strange infatuation of this nation has led them in many cases to rally around the standards of the most impious and hair-brained pretenders to the high office of the Messiahship.

The history of this people certainly forms a striking evidence of the truth of divine revelation. They are a living and perpetual miracle; continuing to subsist as a distinct and peculiar race for upwards of three thousand years, intermixed among almost all the nations of the world—flowing forward in a full and continued stream, like the waters of the Rhone, without mixing with the waves of the expansive lake through which the passage lies to the ocean of eternity.

Digitized by Google

CHRISTIANITY.

Christianity is the religion of Jesus Christ, who appeared in the world more than 1800 years ago, and by the most astonishing miracles gave evidence that his mission was divine.

Strictly speaking, none are Christians but those who are imbued with the spirit of Christ, agreeably to the declaration of Scripture, "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Rom. viii. 9. But there is another sense in which whole nations are denominated Christians, viz. where Christianity is the received religion, in opposition to all other religions. In this sense we shall use the term in treating of the various religions of the earth in this department of our work.

Christianity is divided into three portions—the Greek church, which is established by law in Russia, prevails in Greece, Hungary, and part of Turkey, and embraces 70,000,000 of people. The Roman Catholic, Latin, or Western church, maintains the supremacy of the Pope, prevails in many parts of Europe, and has a considerable number of followers in North America. In some of the West India islands, in Mexico, Guatemala, and South America, it is the established religion. The whole number of Catholics may be estimated at 116,000,000. The Protestants are those who protest against the Roman Catholic church, and take the Bible as their guide. They may be comprised under eleven general heads, as follows:—Lutherans, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Moravians, Baptists, Methodists, Friends or Quakers, Universalists, Swedenborgians, and Shakers. These general divisions are subdivided into forty or fifty smaller divisions. The Protestant religion in its various forms prevails in the United States, England, Scotland, Wales, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Prussia, &c.

The following table shows the estimates of Hassel and Malte-Brun of the various religions:—

ACCORDING TO HASSEL.

Pagans,	561,829,300
Christians,	252,565,700
Mahometans,	120,105,000
Jews,	3,930,000
Total,	938,421,000

Divisions of Christians.

Roman Catholics,	134,732,000
Greek Church,	56,011,000
Protestants,	55,791,000
Monophysites,	3,865,000
Armenians,	1,799,000
Nestorians, &c.	367,000
Total,	252,565,700

Digitized by Google

Divisions of Protestants.

Lutherans,	24,264,800
Reformed, or Calvinists,	12,759,900
Episcopalians,	14,905,000
Methodists, Baptists, &c.	3,862,000
Total,	55,791,700

Divisions of Mahometans.

Sonnites,	99,704,000
Schiites,	15,321,000
Wahabees,	5,000,000
Sofis,	80,000
Total,	120,105,000

Divisions of Pagans.

Buddhists,	315,977,000
Bramins,	111,353,000
Fetichists,	66,667,300
Sect of Sinto, *Japan*,	25,200,000
Sect of Tao-tse, *China*,	25,000,000
Shamans,	11,200,000
Followers of Confucius,	3,000,000
Seiks, Parsees, &c.	3,423,000
Total,	561,820,300

ACCORDING TO MALTE-BRUN.

Catholics,	116,000,000
Greek Church,	70,000,000
Protestants,	42,000,000
Christians,	228,000,000
Jews,	4,000,000
Mahometans,	103,000,000
Bramins,	60,000,000
Shamans, (Grand Lama,)	50,000,000
Buddhists, (Fo, &c.)	100,000,000
Fetichists, &c.	100,000,000
Total,	645,000,000

According to Hassel's computation, much more than one half of the inhabitants of the globe are in the darkness of *Paganism;* nearly one eighth in the delusions of *Mahometanism*; and not much more than one quarter enjoy the light of the *Gospel.*

Digitized by Google

The following Report is laid before our readers as containing an expose of our views on the subject of Co-operation. We have only to say, that we have experienced various very beneficial results from the adoption of the resolutions, and the carrying into effect the principles herein developed.

REPORT

Of the Proceedings of a General Meeting of Messengers, from thirteen congregations, held in Wellsburg, Va. on Saturday, the 12th of April, 1834.

THE brethren in Wheeling, sensible that something was wanting among themselves to fill up the measure of their relative duties to the congregations in their immediate vicinity and to society at large; being also apprehensive that the congregations within their knowledge were, from similar circumstances, deficient in doing all that is enjoined on the citizens of Christ's kingdom—at one of their meetings in January last, addressed a letter to the brethren in Wellsburg, wishing them to take these matters into consideration, and soliciting their aid and co-operation in the use of whatever means might, on mature deliberation, be thought wanting to finish the things begun, and to perfect what is wanting to the good order of the congregations, and to their usefulness to the world. For this purpose letters were addressed to a number of congregations in the counties of Ohio and Brooke and the surrounding country, soliciting also their aid and co-operation. A meeting was finally agreed upon in Wellsburg, and messengers from the congregations were appointed to assemble there on the 12th of the present month, that the brethren might confer face to face upon these subjects. Messengers from thirteen congregations assembled on the day appointed; and, could the brethren in Wheeling have addressed a greater number of churches, doubtless the meeting would have been still larger.

The meeting was organized by appointing brother *John Brown*, President, and brethren *Isaac Hoge* and *J. T. M'Vay*, Secretaries. After social worship the object of the meeting was stated, and the matters to be examined were submitted in the form of three questions:—

1st. In all the relations in which the congregations stand to themselves and to the world, is there any thing wanting to the full discharge of all that is enjoined upon them by the great King and Head of the Church?

This question being unanimously answered in the affirmative, the second question was, *What are the things wanting?*

On this question it was agreed that every brother present should, in answer to his name, state, from his own views of what pertained to the congregations, and from his own experience and observation, what, in his judgment, was wanting.

Some doubts were expressed whether such a meeting was in accordance with any precept, precedent, or principle suggested in the

Digitized by Google

New Testament, and whether the things wanting could be set in order, or any means adopted by the brethren present to remedy any defects which should appear in the congregations, either with respect to their internal or external relations.

The discussion of this question was waved until the brethren should fully express their views of the things wanting; then it was alleged that it would be in order to consider whether, according to the letter or spirit of the Apostles' teaching, such a meeting, or any meeting for consultation, or any co-operation of congregations was either necessary or expedient, on any emergency, or in reference to any duties incumbent upon the congregations, either in reference to their internal or external relations.

The names of the brethren from each congregation were then called; and, in answer to their names, every brother present gave his views of the things wanting. The things wanting in order to fill up the views of all present on what is enjoined upon the congregations, both with respect to the internal and external relations of every congregation, are comprized in the following particulars:—

1. A systematic co-operation of the churches for the conversion of the world.

2. Proclaimers, of good moral character, and of suitable qualifications, to proclaim the word and teach the ordinances of Jesus Christ.

3. Better order in the congregations in their meetings on the Lord's day.

4. Overseers in the congregations to take the oversight, and preside over them as the Apostles directed.

5. More general knowledge of the scriptures, and marked attention to the teachings of the Holy Apostles.

The third and last question was next proposed, viz.—*How are the things wanting to be set in order?* In answering this question, the difficulty on the minds of one or two brethren present, respecting the ways and means by which the things wanting should be set in order, and concerning the propriety and expediency of such a meeting, either for consultation or co-operation, came fairly before the meeting. The difficulty was then fairly submitted, whether the Apostles authorized any such meetings, and whether the congregations in Christ were authorized to co-operate in any measures for the furtherance of the gospel, or for any object connected with the prosperity of the kingdom of Jesus Christ. For it was alleged that from such meetings, and from such efforts towards co-operation, sprang up, in process of time, all the councils and creeds, and intolerance which issued in the Roman hierarchy, and in all the corruptions and tyrannies which were recorded on the pages of ecclesiastical history. It was argued that the Reformation had progressed so far without such aids, and that it might endanger not only the independence of the particular congregations, but the very principles of reformation for which we contended. Moreover, there appeared to be neither precept nor precedent in the New Testament for any other meeting than that of a single congregation.

Digitized by Google

To this it was replied, that no institution, human or divine, was free from abuse; that man was never placed in circumstances incompatible with a state of trial; that in Eden, and out of it, man was a responsible and accountable agent; and that as such, God could not institute any system which would interfere with a state of probation, and therefore the abuse of every institution and every blessing and privilege is possible. But the abuse of any institution or of any blessing never can be a reason or argument against the use of it. Were it otherwise, the gospel ought never to be preached: for nothing had been more abused than the gospel itself, and nothing more perverted than the preaching of it. Who would refuse to give alms to the poor, because charity had been abused? or what disciple would withhold all his substance from works of benevolence, because the fruit of benevolence itself had been often misapplied?

That the Reformation had progressed so far without consultation, co-operation, or contribution, was assuming false premises; for it was by the liberal contributions of individuals—by the consultation and co-operation of members of different congregations—by the labors in word and teaching of individuals, who were sent out by different communities, acting in concert, that were the chief means of its advancement. Individuals, it is true, by the labor of the press, and by voluntary sacrifices in travelling and laboring in the word and teaching, had laid the foundation; but the conquests which were gained, either by these or by those, were the result of combined effort—of consultation and co-operation. And had there been more consultation, co-operation, and combined effort, there is every reason, in the nature of things, and in our own experience, to infer that the triumphs of truth would at this time have been much greater than they are.

But we are asked, What precept or precedent have we for the co-operation of congregations, or for consultative meetings; or what principle propounded in the New Testament authorizes any other meeting than that of a single congregation? If, indeed, the Apostles did, neither by precept, by precedent, nor by any general principle, inculcate or commend such measures, there is obviously no need for them, nor propriety in them. But on the hypothesis that Christianity refuses all co-operation beyond the limits of one congregation, then it has refused the most efficient of all the means which nature and society employ for every great and magnificent work. There is a co-operation among all the host of heaven: The sun, moon, and planets combine all their powers in producing the great effects of nature's laws. All the elements and distinct agents of our globe act in co-operation in all the products of the animal and vegetable kingdoms; and all the great achievements of humankind have been only the effects of collected and concentrated effort. Moreover, when God instituted a social religion, he made it a national care and concern, and united all the families and tribes of Israel in one great system of co operation. By consultative co-operation nations have been formed, cities and temples reared, monuments and towers erected, which have been the wonder of the world.

Digitized by Google

So very social and co-operative is Christianity in all its institutions, that the multitudes who first embraced it came together in one community—had all things common—and were one in all their prayers and efforts—daily in consultation and in co-operation for the promotion of its interests—and kept with one accord in one place, till a violent persecution drove them from the metropolis, and scattered them over Judea and Samaria.

But if we are asked for an express command for congregations to co-operate, or for a consultative meeting to be held of any number of individuals or congregations, we can adduce none. Neither can we produce a command or a precedent for writing, publishing, or printing a line of the Holy Scriptures, nor for building a house for a christian congregation to meet in. Shall we thence infer that the printing of the scriptures, or the translation of them from a dead to a living language, or from one living language to another, is unchristian or unauthorized by the Apostles? If, then, the *principle* is clearly recognized, and the fact established, that the primitive christian congregations did consult together, and co-operate in all affairs pertaining to the conversion of the world, and the prosperity, peace, and happiness of the kingdom of Jesus; then we have sufficient authority to proceed in devising ways and means to further the interests of our Saviour's cause, in every possible way, and by all lawful means.

Now as it derogates nothing from the divine authority for the consecration of the first day of every week, that we have no positive command addressed to any church, saying that it ought to assemble on every first day for the observance of the social ordinances of the Redeemer, because we have an unequivocal precedent that the disciples assembled on that day for the keeping of the ordinances—so neither can it be an argument against consultative meetings or the co-operation of churches, that we have no positive command addressed to the congregations, calling upon them to meet for such purposes, provided we have clear and unequivocal precedents that the christian congregations did even in the age of the Apostles co-operate. It need hardly be observed that if the fact be established that the congregations did co-operate, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that they did consult together on the ways and means of co-operation; for co-operation without consultation would be fortuitous, irrational, and unavailing.

We therefore proceed to show, that the congregations set in order by the Apostles themselves, did, while the Apostles yet lived, co-operate in matters and things of general concern. To say nothing at present of the consultative and co-operative meeting of the congregations in Jerusalem and Antioch, on a question which concerned all the Gentile congregations—(for whatever may be said of the authority of the Apostles to decide all questions of this sort, the meeting there was *consultative;* and the much debate and consultation among the elders and apostles preceding the decision, as narrated by Luke, shows that the meeting was fairly consultative)—I say, passing over this celebrated meeting, we proceed to two very plain cases found in the 8th chapter of the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians.

Digitized by Google

In the 19th verse Paul mentions *"a brother who was chosen by the congregations their fellow-traveller."* Wherever there is a choice made there must have been deliberation; and wherever there has been a choice by congregations, there must have preceded it a consultation of the congregations. This being very evident, we mention a second instance of the same sort, in the same chapter, verse 23. Paul introduces certain *brethren* (whose names are not mentioned) as (apostles) messengers of congregations. "If our brethren," says he, "be inquired of, they are apostles of congregations," (new version)—"messengers of congregations," (common version.) These messengers of congregations were doubtless chosen by the congregations whose messengers they were; and as they were acting in concert with Paul and Titus, it is obvious that the congregations whose messengers they were, at that time were co-operating in some matters of general concern. If it should be alleged that they were only co-operating in matters pertaining to the poor of the congregations, in the supply of their temporal wants, it only strengthens the argument in favor of the co-operation of congregations—by establishing the principle of co-operation in such matters as cannot be effected by a single congregation; and by exhibiting that concern for the welfare of the brethren in small matters, it furnishes a decisive argument for co-operation in the things pertaining to the greater wants and necessities of the brethren, in aid of their spiritual comfort and influence in the world.

But, indeed, the Acts of the Apostles throughout exhibit nothing more plainly in the history of primitive christianity, than the spirit of co-operation. The church in Jerusalem co-operated with all the churches in Judea, and with the churches among the Gentiles as far as their circumstances would allow; and the congregations of the Gentiles co operated with them to the full extent of their opportunities. We find all the congregations alive to the prosperity of each other, and co-operating in aid of all the travelling brethren, selected and commended to the favor of God by the congregations. There was a continual going to and from Jerusalem, Samaria, Antioch, and other great places of resort.

At Antioch Paul chose Silas to accompany him, and the brethren commended them to the protection and patronage of the Lord. They went to Derbe. From Derbe Paul took Timothy; Gaius also, of Derbe, accompanied him. After some time Paul went to Corinth. Erastus, a convert of that city, was chosen to minister to Paul and travel with him. Sopater the Berean, and of the Thessalonians Aristarchus and Secundus, and of the Asiatics Tychicus and Trophimus, besides Gaius of Derbe, and Timothy, were from these congregations, all at one time co-operating with Paul in the work of the Lord. When Paul and his fellow-laborers came to Jerusalem, they lodged together at the house of Mnason a Cyprian, an old disciple, and were cordially received by the Jerusalemites. Luke himself at this time made one of the company. All the elders in Jerusalem were present at the meeting of Paul and James. Paul reported the

Digitized by Google

progress of reform among the Gentiles, and when the Jerusalem elders heard it they glorified the Lord. Immediately a consultation was held concerning how the prejudices existing in the minds of the myriads of the converted Jews, against Paul, might be allayed, and certain measures were agreed upon. Paul acquiesced in the result of their consultation, and went to work accordingly. So prevailed the spirit of consultative co-operation in those primitive times.

Again—the Epistles are full of it. Besides the great congregation in Rome there were several smaller ones in that city and its environs. There was a congregation in the house of Priscilla and Aquila—one that assembled with Asyncritus and his companions—another, that associated with Philologus and his companions. These congregations were commanded to co-operate with a deaconess of the church of Cenchrea, then at Rome, in whatever respects she might need assistance. Paul's companions, Timothy, Luke, Jason, Sosipater, Tertius, (Silas,) and Gaius saluted them in Rome; so did Erastus the Corinthian, and Quartus of that city. Paul tells the Corinthians that all the congregations in Macedonia co-operated in making contributions for the saints in Judea, and that he wished them to co-operate also in that good work, and assured them that when they needed there would be a co-operation of churches in their behalf. He commanded the congregations in Galatia also to co-operate in this affair, and advised the brethren in Corinth to approve some persons by their letters, and he would send them to carry their gift to Jerusalem.

Indeed, all the catholic epistles—of which we have two from Paul; one to the congregations in Galatia—one to the Hebrews; one from James to the brethren in the dispersion; one from Peter to the sojourners in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bythynia: another to all the disciples, and one from John to the churches, imply a co-operation and conjoint interest in all the affairs of the "holy nation," "chosen race," and "royal priesthood" of Christ.

From all which we learn, that in those days there were consultations and co-operations in all things which transcended the knowledge and power of one congregation to effect. And this leads us now to take a more enlarged view than was expressed during our meeting, of all the relations in which the congregations stand to each other and to the world; and this with special reference to the abuses of this principle by the synods and councils to which we have so often alluded.

The Christian congregations, like so many families, have their internal and their external relations. All the children of one family stand in a special relation to each other, and the whole family stand related together. From these relations originate all the duties which they owe one another. But every family in one great community or kingdom, stands related to all the families in that community, and owes to them duties growing out of those relations; and the whole of that community of families stand related to all other communities on earth; and, in consequence of that relation, owe to them a variety of duties: *for all duties spring from the relations in which we stand to*

Digitized by Google

God and one another. Separate communities, which are the component parts of one great community, stand to the whole of that community as individuals in one family stand to one another. The kingdom of Jesus Christ consists of numerous communities, separate and distinct from each other; and all these communities owe as much to each other as the individual members of any one of them owe to all the individual members of that single community of which they are members. Every individual disciple is a particular member of that body (or congregation) with which he is united in christian communion; and the whole of that community to which he belongs is but a member of that great body which is figuratively called "the body of Christ." He is the head of the whole body, or christian congregation; not merely or specially of one community, but of all the separate communities as constituting one kingdom.

The kingdom of Jesus is now *in* the world but not *of* the world. It stands related to the world by strong natural ties; and, from its relation to the world, owes it many duties. For here, as in all other parts of God's dominions, duty or obligation grows out of relation. The duties which the church or kingdom of Jesus Christ owes the world, numerous as they may be made, are all comprehended in one, viz.—its salvation. It is the duty of the church, having in it the oracles of God, to be *the light of the world*, and the *salt* or *salvation of the world.* The Head of the Church before he left the world died for it—erected one congregation, gave it the Oracles, the ordinances, and his spirit —and said on parting, OCCUPY TILL I COME. He has, then, by placing his kingdom in the world, and in such various relations to it, made it the duty of the whole kingdom to convert or save the world—the whole world. If, then, the whole world be not saved, it is not for lack of the sacrifice of Christ—for lack of the Spirit of God—for lack of oracles, or ordinances, or obligations; but for lack of an intelligent, holy, and harmonious co-operation of all the individuals and communities which constitute the kingdom of Jesus Christ.

We are so constituted that we cannot be prosperous or happy but as this work proceeds. Therefore, converting seasons are always refreshing seasons. In watering others, we are moistened and refreshed by the waters of life ourselves. When conversions cease, it is a dry time and a cold time. In the economy of salvation such is the arrangement, that no individual man can be happy but in doing his duty; and no congregation can be prosperous and happy, but as it exerts a converting influence and agency in the world. *The wisdom of the church is, then, a converting policy.* When the soldiers of the cross keep in the ranks of their respective companies, and the companies all march in solid columns, presenting one harmonious and unbroken front to the world, there is no standing before them, and there is incessant joy and rejoicing in the camp. Union here is strength. If the church were now united and acting in holy co-operation, the world would fall before the blast of the gospel trumpet as the walls of Jericho by the blast of the ram's horns when encompassed with the armies of the living God. But to keep to the point:

Digitized by Google

The external relations of the church, or the attitude in which she stands to the world, and the duties which she owes to it, now specially demand our attention.

All that is expected from the church in attempting the salvation of the world, is a full and faithful display of the word and the ordinances of Jesus Christ, sustained by a heavenly temper and a holy behaviour. This every Christian community is in duty bound to do. But there lie beyond its direct influence and example multitudes of brethren in Adam, to whom, in its congregated capacity, it cannot reach. Every Christian is a preacher, and a successful one as far as he has intelligence and character. But all cannot travel; for then there would be no church behind. Neither are all disciples equally qualified to convert sinners. If every church could send out one or more to labor in the word and teaching, then co-operation would not be necessary so far as the means of providing and sustaining those laborers are concerned; yet still there would have to be co-operation and an understanding as to the route and course of proceeding, else they might travel in the same line and occupy the same field. Even Paul and Barnabas must consult and agree upon the route and order of proceeding. Acts xv. 36.

In the conversion of the world co-operation is necessary upon any hypothesis. But this co-operation of communities can extend no farther than a proper selection and application of the means ordained for the conversion of sinners. Co-operation in reference to the internal affairs of congregations, is wholly out of the question. This gave birth to popery, creeds, councils, and all the traditions of the Fathers. As every family regulates its own concerns, so every Christian congregation is to regulate its own individual concerns. It is in the affairs of Christ's kingdom as in the affairs of any well regulated kingdom of this world. Every family has its own relations, rights, obligations, and privileges; but all these families must co-operate in every thing that concerns the public good Every family and every congregation in its individual character is independent of all others as far as the right of regulating its own internal concerns is considered. No one family has a right to interfere with the affairs of another. So in the neighbourhood of churches, they are all independent communities; but neighbourhood association and co-operation are necessary to the prosperity of all. But this is conceded. The only question is, *How far and in what manner ought congregations to co-operate?* The answer to the question *How far?* is short and easy—In every thing which is necessary to the salvation of the world, which they cannot effect at all, or so well in their individual capacity. The principles and examples laid down in the New Testament clearly teach this. And as to the *manner* in which this is to be done, a general law could not be promulged, nor a general precedent laid down, more than for the manner of translating, printing, and publishing the Bible; or for erecting or hiring rooms and houses for church meetings. This must be a matter of expedience and convenience, as times, circumstances, and the exigencies of society require and suggest.

Digitized by Google

Wages for labor in the word is spoken of in the New Testament; but no sum is stipulated, nor any kind of wages specified. Paul said he received *wages* from various congregations while laboring in Corinth, 1 Ep. viii. 8. He was no hireling. A hireling is one who works for the sake of the wages; therefore, every one who receives wages is not a hireling. The laborer is worthy of his *hire*, or wages. The wages may be either money, which represents property, or the things of which it is but the representative. Now as one congregation may not have the means of supporting one evangelist or proclaimer of the word all the time, however convinced that it is both necessary and expedient; and if one or two congregations with it are able jointly to obtain and employ one, why should they not? And if two or three congregations should all meet in one place, or send their messengers to confer upon the person most eligible, or the field of operation and the measure of his labors; what, in such a *manner* of proceeding, is detrimental to the conversion of the world, or ominous to the independence and liberty of the congregations?

There is no priesthood—no one cast of men in such an economy of expediency. There is no legislation for congregations, no compulsory enactments—no interference with the internal relations, duties, or privileges of a single congregation. It is not a body representative—it is not a mixture of clergy and laity on the principles of any sect in christendom. It is not a conference of priests—a synod of deacons and elders—an association of clergy and laity on the principles of a church representative—making laws for the internal affairs of congregations, passing decrees of exclusion on points of doctrine or matters of opinion; but a meeting of churches, by their messengers, or in person, with a reference to the faithful and full performances of those duties which grow out of the external relations of the church to the world. All now admit that co-operation is necessary, and for the purposes specified; and that no harm to the church is now likely to arise from it; but some may fear the abuse of it hereafter. Baptism and the Lord's supper have been abused, and the Lord knew that they not only *might*, but that they *would* actually be abused; yet he ordained them. He makes the grape to grow, and we may lawfully plant the vine, though some may make a bad use of its fruit. We are not responsible for posterity—we are responsible only for ourselves. Peter is not to be blamed for what his pretended successor has assumed; neither was the meeting, nor the consultations and decrees of the apostles, elders, and the whole congregation in Jerusalem to blame because of the proceedings of the Council of Trent. Nor are we, who, in conformity to the precedents and principles presented in the Living Oracles, co-operate in the full discharge of all our relative duties to the world, if hereafter others should abuse it to interference in the internal affairs of the congregations. Of this we set them no example; and this is all that we have to guard against. We who think it our duty to co-operate with our brethren in the great work of regenerating the world, only ask our brethren who may disagree with us (if any there be) the privilege which they claim to

Digitized by Google

themselves. If they conscientiously withhold their counsel and their property from the work of laboring in the word and teaching, we ask them to allow us the liberty to give our money and our advice in aid of a regular system of co-operation with all who are devoted to the great work of saving the world.

After a full expression of the preceding views (though they are here presented more in detail,) the following resolutions were submitted, discussed, and all of them almost, if not altogether, unanimously adopted by the brethren present; and are now recommended to the congregations for their concurrence:—

Resolved, That in order to remedy one of the things wanting in the churches, it is the duty of the congregations to co-operate in the selection of proper persons to proclaim the word, and to give them directions in their labors, and to exercise a supervision over them.

Resolved, That there shall be a fund raised by voluntary subscription or contribution, in each congregation, for the support of those who labor in the word and teaching; and that this fund shall be forwarded quarterly to a Treasurer, who shall apply it under the direction of a committee to be appointed for that purpose.

Resolved, That this meeting nominate two persons to labor in the word and teaching, under the direction of a committee, and that they be recommended to the congregations for their concurrence.

Resolved, That brethren Robert H. Forrester, of Pittsburg; John Henry, William Haden, and Jonas Hartzil, of Ohio, be recommended to the congregations; and that whichever two of them can be first obtained, shall, with the concurrence of the brethren, be employed to labor in the word and teaching.

Resolved, That the following persons be appointed a committee to direct and superintend the labors of the brethren nominated in the 4th resolution, namely:—R. Richardson, of Wellsburg; J. T. M'Vay, of Bethany; John Hindman, of the Cove; Robert Nichols, of Centre; Thomas Wier, of Steubenville; Absalom Titus, of Dutch Fork; J. Hoge, of Wheeling; Joel F Martin, of Warren; Cyrus M'Neely, of Cadiz; James Hough, of West Liberty; Joshua Carle, of Salt Run; William Cochrane, of Middletown, Ohio; Samuel Grafton, of King's Creek. And, of these, any three shall be a quorum, all of whom shall be notified by a Corresponding Secretary.

Resolved, That *John Brown* be appointed Treasurer, and *J. T. M'Vay* Corresponding Secretary of the congregations co-operating in these resolutions.

Resolved, That A. Campbell and J. T. M'Vay be appointed a committee to report the objects and proceedings of this meeting to the congregations here represented.

Resolved, That the congregations of disciples in this co-operation will not countenance or patronize any person as a public proclaimer of the word, who is not now known to the brethren, or who has not been appointed by some congregation, and has not testimonials of his good standing.

Digitized by Google

Resolved, That any of the congregations who may desire to co-operate with us on the basis of these resolutions, shall be received on application to the Corresponding Secretary, or at the next meeting.

Resolved, That this meeting now adjourn to meet again on the last Friday of September next, with the Cadiz church, five miles east of Cadiz, Ohio; and that a two days public meeting be there held on the seventh and first days following.

The brethren will perceive that these resolutions have respect only to the things wanting in reference to our external relations to the world, and that it is chiefly designed to ascertain how far the different congregations will co-operate in a regular systematic course of proceeding, for the purpose of keeping constantly in the field some competent and faithful laborers, who will devote themselves to the work of the Lord in converting the world. Before any steps can be taken, it will be necessary to ascertain, with tolerable accuracy, not only that the congregations are willing to co-operate in this work, but what they can do, before we present any inducement to competent brethren to come and labor in the bounds of these congregations. The first quarter commenced with the first of the present month (April,) and will expire on the first day of June, at which time it will be necessary that their contributions for the gospel be forwarded to the Treasurer elect.

A perfect unity of opinion (especially when many minds are concerned) in questions of expediency, is not to be expected in any matter—not even in the most common affairs of this life. In all these affairs the few must yield to the many. Paul and Barnabas could not agree in a matter of expediency; but this did not issue in a breach of brotherhood or christian communion. But if the few will not yield to the many, schisms must occur on every question of business. Our brotherhood in Christ is on the basis of one faith, one Lord, one immersion, one God, one Spirit, one hope. These make one body. And in all other matters it is, "Receive one another cordially, without regard to differences in opinion."

It is our duty to co-operate, our duty to labor for the conversion of the world—to devote our time, our property, our talents to the Lord's work. This is our honor and our happiness. The ways and means may be better or they may be worse, in the estimation of the many or the few; but already we have the assurance of much unanimity in the ways and means of co-operating in reference to our present duties arising from our external relations.

One word, brethren, and we have done. The salvation of the world called for the richest and best and largest bounty of God in the gift of his Son. It cost the only begotten Son of God a life of humiliation, mortification, poverty, and self-abasement, terminated by a painful and ignominious death. It cost the Apostles the sacrifice of their whole lives. The first Christians took joyfully the spoiling of their property, and gave up not only their substance, but their lives also in the propagation of the faith. In every age since, the true and

Digitized by Google

faithful disciples of Christ have suffered much, sacrificed much, and labored much in the same good cause; and shall we withhold our hands, and refuse a little of that abundance and of those bounties which the Lord has bestowed on us, when in his word and in his providence he honors us by making a demand upon us as his stewards?

By order of the meeting—

J. T. M'VAY,
A. CAMPBELL.

Questions on Regeneration.

JAMESTOWN, *Ohio*, February 9, 1835.

Beloved brother Campbell,

INASMUCH as all the sects in christendom advocate the doctrine of the *new birth*—(none, I believe, but what hold it essential)—what a pity it is that they cannot agree as to what it is! If this one point in theology were settled, I conclude that the great fountain of sectarianism would soon dry up.

I should like to see the answers of all the sects now in christendom to the following questions, viz.—

1. What is the new birth?
2. What is its design?
3. At what time did it begin?
4. Who are the subjects of it?
5. How long will it continue?

I suppose that it would require more volumes to contain all the metaphysical answers to the five simple questions above stated, than it does to contain Rollin's History of Nations.

But suppose I were to give answers to these questions in a plain common sense way, do you think that one sheet of paper would contain them? I will try, and see. To begin, then:—

1st. *What is the new birth?*

Answer.—It is a *birth of water* as directed by the Holy Spirit when he spoke by our Lord and his Apostles, which directions are recorded in the New Testament; or, as expressed by the Apostle, it is a *bath of water by the word?"*

2d. *What is its design?*

Answer.—It is designed to manifest the children of faith; or, in the words of the Apostle, to make known "the children of Abraham by faith in Christ Jesus."

3d. *At what time did it begin?*

Answer.—It began when the kingdom of Heaven was set up in the days of the Kings mentioned by the Prophet Daniel, and brought the subjects of it into said kingdom, to which it had particular reference.

4th. *Who are the subjects of it?*

Answer.—Those who believe the gospel preached by the Apostles, and reform their lives; or, in other words, those who shape their lives by the gospel as recorded in the New Testament.

Digitized by Google

5th. *How long will it continue?*

Answer.—Until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, or until the accomplishment of all things spoken by the Prophets, or until Jesus returns again; or, in other words, it will continue as long as the church continues to grow upon the earth.

I have now answered all of the questions in a few words. But, says the metaphysician, you have not answered the first question—*What is the new birth?* Well, I will now hear your answer or answers, for one will not suffice.

1. It is a something that precedes faith?
2. It is a change of heart.
3. It is a new heart.
4. It is remission of sins.
5. It is not remission of sins, but the joy or pleasant sensations which accompany or follow remission.

I have already got five answers to the one question, and still the question is unanswered. For the first answer involves the absurdity of an unbelieving child of God, and the other four would fix the new birth before the setting up of the new kingdom; for all of these things existed before the advent of the Messiah; and consequently if any one of them, or all of them together, be the new birth, then the new birth preceded the existence of the kingdom into which it brings the offspring. This would be like bringing men into the world before the world was made.

M. WINANS.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

Charity.

PHILADELPHIA, February 6, 1835.

Dear brother Winans,

THERE is nothing more evident to my mind, than that the success of our holy endeavor to convert our brethren from the error of their ways, depends very much upon our own obedience to the divine command, "*Let all your things be done with charity.*" The lamentable fact that charity, which rejoiceth in truth only, is perverted as a cover to disobedience, does not set aside either the authority or importance of this holy injunction. Our *object* is to be humbly instrumental of bringing back the wandering flock of the divine Shepherd (including ourselves) to his own fold of truth and blessedness. Our *means* must be "speaking the truth *in love.*" I offer these remarks to my respected brother, after reading his declaration, "I have never seen one of those 'faith alone' men but that he was disobedient himself, and endeavored to make others so." It is a fact that many "accepted in the beloved" have advocated the doctrine of justification by faith alone: even men who have believed the truth of the holy record, confessed it by immersion, and adorned it by their lives. But

Digitized by Google

what do they mean by the doctrine of justification by faith alone? Not that men professing to believe the truth and continuing in sin are in a justified state, or that the justified will be finally judged by faith alone. They believe that men will be judged according to their words and actions, both here and at the last day. They understand the case of Abraham offering up his son Isaac, and "how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect." They see, in this sense, "how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." Why, then, you will ask, do they ever speak of justification by faith alone? Because faith is the *only* thing which the record of eternal truth declares to be by God *imputed to*, or *counted to* men for righteousness or justification. "What saith the Scriptures? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." "To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Rom. v. In verses 23 and 24 the Apostle plainly teaches that God imputes righteousness or justification to all believers on the ground of faith. Faith alone is mentioned as being counted for righteousness or justification. I know not any good men holding the doctrine of justification by 'faith alone' in any other sense. You may, indeed, think this is insufficient to justify the declaration that men are justified by 'faith alone;' but I trust you will be convinced, that every such person ought not to be charged with being 'disobedient himself,' or with endeavoring 'to make others so.'

You think that "there is nothing more absurd than for a 'faith alone' man to teach repentance. To repent for that which has already been forgiven, or to repent of sins after they have been pardoned, is, what I should call, *the pinnacle* of absurdity." I see no absurdity in supposing that repentance both precedes and follows forgiveness. If you have, in a moment of excitement, treated an affectionate wife unkindly; and she, perceiving your repentance, cordially forgives you, is any subsequent sorrow or repentance that you should have so treated her, mounting 'the pinnacle of absurdity?'

You remark, "To speak of repentance before faith, as some do, is to make the knowledge of sin precede the knowledge of law." Many unprofitable disputes about the precedence of faith or repentance might have been avoided, had the fact been duly considered that faith has *a variety of objective truths*. To speak of repentance previous to faith in *any* truth, is obviously absurd. Repentance for sin "towards God," certainly implies a belief in his existence and character. But to speak of the necessity of repentance for sin, before believing in Jesus Christ as actually saving us from our sins, is both rational and scriptural. "The whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." Coming to God by faith in his Son, for the forgiveness of sin, implies repentance of the sin we wish to be forgiven. He that confesseth and forsaketh his sin shall find mercy, or forgiveness. Repentance is before forgiveness both with God and men. Indeed, it is impossible for a man to accept *forgiveness*, while he is insensible that he has offended. Faith in Christ, then, *in respect to our obtaining*

Digitized by Google

actual forgiveness through his blood, must necessarily be subsequent to our repentance.

While we endeavor to obtain clear and correct views of divine truth, let us, above all things, put on charity or love, which is the bond of perfectness.

Yours in christian love,

HENRY GREW.

PHILADELPHIA, February 19, 1835.

Dear brother Campbell,

BY direction of the church I forward you for publication in the *Millennial Harbinger*, a copy of a precious epistle received from our afflicted but blessed brother *Ballantine*.

Affectionately yours,

HENRY GREW.

TO THE CHURCH MEETING IN BANK STREET.

Beloved Brethren,

IT pleases the Lord to lay his hand upon me by a painful disease, which detains me from your assemblies: but good is his will. Have I received so much good from his hand, and shall I not receive evil also? Though absent from you, nevertheless I am present in spirit, beholding the steadfastness of your faith, and joying in the order of our heavenly Father's house. It is my earnest prayer before the throne of his grace, that we may be perfect and entire in the whole of his will, making increase with a great increase in all the fruits of the Spirit. Brethren, we are called to purity in soul, body, and spirit, and to abound in that holiness, the holiness of the truth, without which no one shall see the Lord. I am filled with joy, when I consider your association in the kingdom of our Lord. Such is your church state, that, delivered from the sects of the present day, you may walk in the fear of the Lord, in the comforts of the Holy Spirit, being edified and comforted, building up each other in your holy faith. Brethren, I beseech you, improve your vast advantages. Never forsake the assembling of yourselves together, and engage with all the holy fervors of devotion, continuing steadfastly in the teaching of the Apostles, in the fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in the prayers: and ever remember, that these ordinances of Heaven are intended and calculated, by the supply of the Spirit of all grace, to keep up a continued intercourse with our heavenly Father through the mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ. Thus our assembling together will be for the better, and not for the worse. Be concerned also, brethren, to come behind in no gift, that you may be able to edify one another in love. Remember that every good and perfect gift is from the Father of lights, and that he hath said, "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all liberally."

Digitized by Google

Liberal, indeed, are his thoughts and ways towards us. Since I had the happiness of meeting with you, I have indeed endured a great fight of affliction, nor did I ever think I should again be able to put pen to paper; but, blessed be his name, he has enabled me to endure. Lying in his hand, I have been able to say, "All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come." I must say to the praise of his glorious name, that while my outward man has been perishing, my inward man has been renewing day by day. I can tell no one the pains, oppression, and uneasiness of body I have suffered; but it is all light and trivial, compared to the joys and exstatic pleasures I have enjoyed in fellowship with our heavenly Father, and with Jesus his beloved Son! O! what pleasures in the love of the Father, and in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ! The Lord has given me years of delightful study in all the parts of his revealed will; and now, in the close of my existence here, he gives me to take an enlarged and succinct view of the whole Book. How beautiful its parts! How stupendously great its whole! The Messiah crucified! Blessed Jesus! the brightness of the Father's glory! No wonder that when Philip said to thee, "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us," that thou didst reply, "Have I been so long with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" who sent me. Blessed God, who has made all thy glory centre and be displayed in thy beloved Son; so that we now, with the most unbounded confidence in all thy perfections, hear the song of angels, "Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, and good will towards men!" Father of lights, thou art light, and in thee is no darkness at all. And thou that didst command the light to shine out of darkness, hast shined into the hearts of the holy Apostles, to give the light of the knowledge of all thy great name in the face, the person, the work, of thy beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, that they might reflect this light upon the benighted sons of men; that thou mightest make thy great name to be known, not to the Jews only, but to all the ends of the earth, as the Lord God, merciful and gracious, slow to anger, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin, and by no means clearing the guilty. Father, who is a God like to thee! O! the depth of the wisdom and knowledge of God! O! the endearments of redeeming love! God glorified—man saved! Meditate on these things.

WILLIAM BALLANTINE.

Camden, N. J. February 6, 1835.

M. Winans' Reply to J. B. of New York.

JAMESTOWN, *Ohio*, February 23, 1835.

Brother Campbell,

OUR friend J. B. of New York, will no doubt be surprised to find that there is but little, if any difference between him and me, as to ***the last days*** spoken of by Joel, and others in the Scriptures.

Digitized by Google

He says, "The only consistent view he [Winans] will discover, in my opinion, is, that the phrase *last days* refers to the last revelation God would make to man."

So far, I am happy to say, there is no difference between us; but I must say further, that I honestly believe that God finished his revelations to man *by the Apostles*, and that he fully confirmed all that he spoke by them, by signs, wonders, and divers gifts of the Holy Spirit, and that too, while they lived.

But my friend J. B. is not willing that the *last days* should be confined to the last days of God's revelations. He wants *these last days* extended to all time from the coming of the Messiah to the end of the world. But this extension would be inconsistent with J. B's own opinion; unless he is of the opinion that God has continued to make revelations to man since the death of the Apostles. If this be his opinion, then we do honestly differ in this matter: for if this be true, *the faith* (testimony) was not delivered to the saints by the Apostles, but only a part of it; the mould or form of doctrine was not finished: therefore the saints in Rome could not have obeyed it. Besides, Peter ought to have stirred up the pure minds of the saints to what was yet to be delivered, as well as to what had been spoken by the Prophets and commanded by the Apostles of the Lord.

The writer to the Hebrews is also at fault; for he speaks as though *God had finished his speech by his Son*, and that it had been fully confirmed to the saints by them that heard him, (not by them that heard of him, by many miracles and divers gifts of the Holy Spirit, which God wrought by them and conferred upon them; as Mark also testifies. chap. xvi. ver. 20. "And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs. But I regret that J. B. has so far misunderstood me as to suppose that I aimed to separate what God joined together—"*the Word and the Spirit.*" So far from it, that I have always opposed abstraction, and especially the abstractions taught in this our day—how that *God* does some things apart from his Spirit and his word, and that the *Spirit* does some things apart from God and his word, and that the *Word* does some things apart from God and his Spirit. This analyzing process is a part of spiritual chemistry that I have not yet learned. I know of nothing that God has done, but by his Spirit and his word; not separately, but jointly. Thus he created the world and all things in it—the *Spirit* moved upon the face of the waters, and the *word* brought every thing to view. And thus he made all his revelations to man. The holy men *spoke the word, being moved by the Holy Spirit.*

I think J. B. mistook me in another instance I do not think that I ever intimated that *the Word of God was not the Sword of the Spirit.* So far from it, that I have earnestly contended that the *saints ought to use it* against the King's enemies, as *Paul*, the commander of the Gentile army, commanded to do. He did not command the Spirit to take the Sword; hence I infer that the Spirit made the Sword [spoke the word] for the use of the saints, [not for his own use,] not to be

Digitized by Google

used by himself, as some suppose; among whom I suspect my friend J. B. has heretofore stood.

Passing over what J. B. says of *sophistry* and of *hypocrisy*, I will only ask him to allow me the exercise of *reason*, and will come directly to the question proposed by him:—"I ask him [Winans] is the blessing of God to be invoked to give effect to the word in the present day?" What did you say? Is God to be asked to give *effect to his own word?* as though his *word* were *dead! I answer, No!* He is not to be prayed to for any such thing; unless it be by such as believe his word to be *lifeless*, without any *spirit in it*; such as separate the *Word* and the *Spirit*, and thereby leave the *Word* a *dead letter*, may pray to God to add *life to his word;* but they will excuse me if I should not join in their prayer. I would as soon think of asking God to *give power to the sun to shine*, as to ask him to *give power to his Word to enlighten the minds of men.* For I honestly believe that his *Word* is as well adapted to the communication of knowledge to man, as the *sun* is to the communication of light to him.

The next *count* in J. B's bill of indictment, is, that I labor to support a dangerous and increasing error; which error is—"That God does not *now*, as in the days of the Apostles, and at all former periods, dispose of the hearts of men to hear his voice and obey his call."—So far from supporting any such thing, I contend that God has placed every motive before man that could induce him to act right, or in obedience to his commands; and that he has not only recorded the *words* spoken at different times by the Prophets and by the Apostles; but that he has also recorded the *miracles* wrought by them in the confirmation of the word. If God at any time *disposed men to hear and obey him*, by any other means than by *words and miracles*, I will listen to J. B. while he tells what those means were, or until he shows that God *disposed men* without means, if he can.

I will now close this communication by referring J. B. to what is said by Mrs. Reed in her last reply to Mr. Payne, in pages 76, 77, of the current vol. of the Harbinger. She is there made to express my views better than I myself could have expressed them, had I been personally present.——As ever yours,

M. WINANS.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

La Fayette, Chambers County, *Ala.* January, 1835.

Dear brother Campbell,—ALTHOUGH personally unacquainted with you, yet I hope you will indulge me in the effort I now make of writing to you. It affords me peculiar gratification to be enabled to express a sincere love for one whom I formerly disliked and traduced under the training of a sectarian system, such as the Baptist; and from the impressions made upon my mind by the "Christian Index" (of Dr. Brantly) I formed, as I have lately discovered very erroneous views, both of the christian religion and of yourself as the

conductor of a press, which has for its object the restoration of the ancient gospel. I preached continually what I then thought, and uttered many things which were not only in opposition to the truth of God, but in derogation of yourself. I will now briefly state how my views in many respects became changed.

During the past summer, while travelling through South Carolina, as the agent of the Baptist denomination in that state, one of my appointments brought me near the residence of Captain S. G. Earle. I had understood that he was what is generally called a "Campbellite;" and from the views which I then entertained of what is most slanderously dubbed "Campbellism," I had no desire to see this disciple. But at the request of a Baptist preacher, I paid him a visit, and remained with him two or three days; during which time I opened the "Christian Baptist," and notwithstanding all my prejudices, light and truth prevailed to a considerable degree and gave a thirst for more. My Testament was more delightful than ever, because I ceased looking for a hidden, and contented myself with the plain natural meaning. I gave up all imaginary things, whether they consisted in what I called my own experience or that of others, and rested upon the word and testimony of Him who can neither lie nor deceive. I saw salvation by grace in its true light, and not as fatalism; and found that true christian happiness consisted not in efforts to feel distressed and to weep, but in receiving and obeying the truth in the love of it. Since that time, although I have been misrepresented throughout the extent of South Carolina, I have enjoyed more peace than in all the rest of my life.

The situation of my pecuniary affairs rendered a removal to this state necessary; and here have I removed, determined to devote myself, as far as my abilities may extend, to preaching and teaching the true gospel of Jesus Christ. Here I find many following men's inventions, creeds and confessions, making parties, and each party making its creed not only a bond of union, but a term of communion. I shall make every effort to bring them all together upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. If I should not succeed, I will make continual effort to draw together a congregation for Jesus Christ, in which we can commemorate his death and resurrection every Lord's day, as well as yield obedience to all the commandments of the New Testament.

JOHN M. BARNES.

BALTIMORE, February 4, 1835.

I WOULD now call your attention to something more interesting. We as a church are getting along gradually and with a healthy growth. We add almost every week one, two, and sometimes more to our number. On next Lord's day we are to receive Richard Lemmon and his wife. These two were baptized by W. Broaddus on his first visit to our city. R. L. is a man of fine talents, and will be a great advocate for the cause. Our number now is over a hundred and fifty.

My good brother, I find the old saying holds good in the kingdom as well as in the world, that "when riches increase, so in proportion does trouble increase;" and the world has another maxim which it would be well for the church to observe—that is, "to get rich by saving;" for in the kingdom we see, and we regret it, much exertion made to add members to the church, when very little care is taken to guide, teach, and take care of those already brought in. There is much need that the present reformation be always reminded that as much care should be taken of those brought in, and as much effort to effect this as to convert sinners.

The need of this will be seen when we consider the various materials out of which the church is made, and the different grades of character which the gospel brings into the kingnom, and intends to make all one in Christ Jesus. What wisdom is in the plan of Heaven, which is able to do this! How fit is

Digitized by Google

the Apostle's exhortation, "Ye, the strong, ought to bear the infirmities of the weak; to suffer long and be kind; to support the weak; to be patient toward all; to lift up the hands which hang down; to confirm the feeble knees; to make straight paths for our feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way, but rather that it be healed." The wisdom from above is truly necessary to keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace. "Be ye wise as serpents and harmless as doves." This is all needful, my good brother. When we see brought into the church, for example, one who is to all human appearance blameless, a *Nathaniel;* another by the same gospel is plucked from the vortex of dissipation; a third with a strong mind and good education; another, weak and untaught in every thing but that Jesus is the Son of God; some rich, and others poor; some honorable in the eyes of men, and others lightly esteemed; some white and some black: these all coming together into one body, washed by the same fountain, having all made the same good confession, participants of the same immunities here, and heirs of the same good hope. Now in order that these people should enjoy peace and comfort, and grow in favor with God and one another, there must be strict attention paid to the above heavenly injunctions.

Now, my brother, should those who would watch over the flock of God deal with them in their various grades alike, should we expect the like amount of fruit from each? No; I think we are to look for fruit in the ratio of talent given, and the particular circumstances which are placed around each in the providence of God. Some have naturally good dispositions—some, the reverse—some have sore trials in the circumstances in which they are placed—others know not what trials of an outward kind are—some are blessed with good health—some hardly ever know any thing of this blessing—some rich, and others having poverty their constant companion. Looking at the church in this way, what need is there for that temper of mind, which was so conspicuous in Jesus, to rule and reign in the kingdom!

Indeed, I sometimes think that the present state of things would, in order to promote the interests of the Saviour in the world, need as many overseers in the congregations as evangelists in the world, in order to extend the kingdom; for I would ask any of my dear brethren, what use is it to bring into the kingdom a number of the variety above described, if left to their resources to war against their enemies, the seductions of the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life? It needs daily care and caution to ward off the degenerate world. No doubt but you have seen much evil arise by the wrong application of means. Lawful means may be applied in a way and with a spirit that will do injury in regulating affairs in the church of God. To warn the unruly, we must understand the rule and the spirit by which it should be successfully applied. When a regiment of men is first brought together for training, no one ever thinks that every enlisted man is able properly to teach the tactics of the army. No, the man who has been long drilled himself is usually the disciplinarian; and if any should be awkward, slow to learn, and cannot keep pace with the rest, are they disbanded or turned away? Nay, verily; but pains are taken and patience exercised toward them until they can march like their companions in good order; and surely the like, and more care and patience should be exercised with the awkward of the army of the Lord. On those that are less honorable, on them we should bestow the more abundant honor. I have touched this subject not so much for any light that I can throw upon it, as to draw your mind and that of my beloved brethren to it every where.

CHAS. FARQUHARSON.

WILLIAMSPORT, Md. February 11, 1835.

I AM now in this part of the country. Since last Friday, the 6th, I have preached several times on Beaver creek; and, notwithstanding the intensity of the cold, have succeeded in persuading five of our race to obey the Master. The sectarians made it a matter of certainty that no one would confess the Lord such weather as this; and, indeed, one of the gentlemen who obeyed on

Digitized by Google

Tuesday night, as he went to the meeting, asked one of the disciples if he thought any one would come out that night, it appearing to him a very unlikely thing. But before his eyes were closed in sleep, they were closed in a watery grave. The disciples are doing generally well, and there is no lack among them except the proclamation of the word. They have prevailed on me to stay over next week; and, indeed, when I see the harvest, I lament the scarcity of laborers in this field: but my hands are full of business.

JAS. HENSHALL.

HANOVER, Va. January 21, 1835.

YOU will recollect that you published a letter from A. C. in the 3d vol. of the Millennial Harbinger, at which time the gospel seemed to bear down all before it in this place; but when that extacy of joy was past there was evidently a reaction; and some, being more accustomed to act by feelings than the word, requested us not to read the book so much in meeting, but to tell feelings or experiences; and for that reason and some others, they chose not to walk with us, and accordingly took letters from us, one after another, until 25 left us, and were constituted a church about a year ago; and when this was done we delayed no time in putting off the Babylonish garments yet left, and repairing to Jerusalem; and now, through mercy, we number about 80, and are walking in gospel order as far as we have learned it. We meet every Lord's day to commemorate his death, and contribute as the Lord has prospered us.

C. B.

Reformation---No. 5.

THE morality of the gospel extends to all the relations in which man stands to man. The perfection of the evangelical system consists in this—that it fully contemplates all these relations, even to the most minute, and graduates all its requirements upon the benevolent principle of practical utility. There is not an arbitrary requisition in all the moral code. The things enjoined are not right simply because enjoined, but they are right in themselves whether enjoined or not. A supernatural knowledge of man in the author of the gospel code, is as clearly apparent to him intimately acquainted with the Christian Scriptures, as the eternal power and divinity of the Architect of the universe, is to the eye of the rational student of nature. The evidences of intelligent design, however numerous and striking, every where imprinted on the face of the heavens and earth, do not more irresistibly arrest the attention and command the reverence of the true philosopher, than do the wisdom and benevolence of christian morality, assert the divine mission and unction of the author and founder of the christian faith.

The marriage covenant is the root and origin of all natural relationship amongst mankind. The very names husband, wife, father, mother, parent, son and daughter, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, cousin, nephew, ancestor, descendant, &c. &c. are but the representatives of the relations which spring from it. Now all the duties that belong to these parties in reference to one another, have their obligation from the nature of these relations, of which God himself is the author.

The training of a family, to those who have entered into the nuptial covenant, is, therefore, the paramount moral concern. The nursery

Digitized by Google

is of necessity the primary school of morality and religion. Here the seeds are sown which are to blossom in youth, and to bring forth fruit in manhood and old age. The general rule which obtains here, is, whatever a man sows, that also shall he reap. If into the tender mind and affections of the infant family the good word of God is sown, cherished, and watered by parental goodness and holy affection, the tender blade of youthful piety and morality will be the happy presage of the rich harvest of manly virtue and moral excellency of riper years.

The disciples of Jesus Christ are commanded to "bring up their children in the correction and instruction of the Lord." Delightful task! "In keeping all his commandments there is a great reward." The command implies a blessing; and teaches, more than a thousand lectures, the practicability of the duty enforced. If parents could not thus educate their children, they would not have been thus commanded; and they would not have been thus commanded, had not a blessing been intended in the obedience.

Now the question is, How shall this command be obeyed? Do those parents reverence the authority of the Saviour and keep his commandments, who do not early and habitually endeavor to inscribe the testimony of God upon the fleshly tables of the hearts of their infant offspring? Who do not by precept and example enforce upon their attention, faith in God and hope in his salvation? Are those parents bringing up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, who do not daily and constantly, morning and evening, bow the knee in their presence, and in every thing give thanks to God before them? Are those parents training their children for heaven, who, while at church themselves, on the Lord's day, permit their children to seek their companions and instructers in the lanes and alleys of the city, or in the woods and fields of the country? If this be obeying Jesus Christ—if this be parental affection—if this be obeying the apostolic injunction, then are the infidels and sceptics, the lawless and the profane, educating their children for Jesus Christ, and bringing them up in the correction and instruction of the Lord!

But then the question will be propounded, Are not they who "command their children and their households," as the Lord said Abraham would govern his; who lead their children by the hand to the "house of God," on the day of the resurrection, and to the fireside morning and evening social thanksgivings and prayers; and imbue their infant minds with the fear of God, which Solomon styled "the beginning of wisdom;"—who are at all pains to teach them the Holy Scriptures, and to guard them against the contagion of vice and immorality found in the streets and hedges, in the city and in the hamlet, unnecessarily devout, affectionate, and laborious! Are they not too strict, too severe, too anti-republican in their paternal discipline? There is a fault on the one side or on the other. The two systems are more at variance than Calvinism and Arminianism. Now if there be no scriptural reason, precept, nor precedent for habituating

Digitized by Google

our children to attendance at the weekly meetings of the people of God, or for accustoming them to assemble at the hour of morning and evening prayers and religious instruction; certainly there is no scriptural reason, precept, nor precedent for giving them up to their own will and pleasure, for setting them adrift on the current of vice and immorality in the very morning of life, while reason, the Bible, and political law recognize them as not only minors, but as wholly the property, and under the absolute government of their parents.

If, indeed, we were mere fatalists as respects both worlds, the present and the future; if we believe that a destiny without means, unchangeable and uncontrollable, awaited all, and frustrated all human efforts; then we might put the reins of discipline into the hands of our infants, and, under the guidance of their own passions and appetites, usher them into the field of action. But on no other principle of reason or expediency, and still less of scriptural authority or licence, can it be done.

But my republican and religious neighbor says, 'Would you have us to seize the understanding of our children, captivate their hearts, and enslave their consciences, as the Romanists, the Protestants, the Jews, the Turks, the Pagans, impose their religion upon their offspring, and thus rivet upon them our religion, authoritatively forestalling their own judgment and deliberate choice!' I certainly would have you bring them up for the Lord; and if this means that you should imbue their minds with no religion at all, but leave them a perfect *charte blanche* as to the name and perfections of God and every religious and moral idea, then be this your choice. May we not put the Holy Scriptures into their hands, let them see a good example, hear our prayers for them, and listen to our songs of praise, without destroying their mental independence, or divesting them of the liberty of choosing whom they shall adore, and in whom they shall confide?

The influence of religious education, supported by an exemplary display of the principles we profess, in a becoming course of action, is immense; and if Jews, Turks, and apostate Christians abuse the trust committed to them, that is no reason why the disciples of Christ should not use the authority, with which God has clothed them over their own offspring.

But suppose that all the false and corrupt religionists in the world should transmit their religion from father to son, as they do their names and their estates, and the christians alone leave their offspring the only prey for proselytism, what fearful odds is thus volunteered on the part of christians to the enemies of Jesus Christ; and what discredit to the wisdom of the author of this religion to say, that he has omitted to employ the best agency on earth in aid of his benevolent scheme of salvation; and allowed his people to expose their offspring uneducated in the knowledge of himself, and undefended from all the snares and dangers of the world!!

It is folly, then, consummate folly, to neglect or pretermit, on any pretext whatever, the religious training of our children from their

Digitized by Google

birth. It is the great business of the christian heads of families—the every day business of their lives, to train their children for the Lord. In this business there is much need of reformation on the part of many disciples. EDITOR.

Steam Boat Reindeer, February 27, 1835.

CONVERSATIONS IN FATHER GOODAL'S FAMILY CIRCLE, AT 'SQUIRE BAXTER'S.

[*Continued from page* 77.]

Mrs. Reed. I have no idea of *naked spirit* in religion, more than I have of *naked divinity* in nature, in giving me food and raiment; but I do not regard the mere elements without the divinity, nor the word without the Spirit of God in giving life to saint or sinner.

Mr. Payne. That view of the subject, Mrs. Reed, strikes my reason with a force little inferior to what we call demonstration. I observe in the great kingdom of nature no abstract power, no abstract divinity; second causes connect us with the Great Unseen, and by them the Great First Cause operates in all the bounties of creation and providence.

Mrs. Reed. We live in Nature's outer court, and can only learn through the types around us the things spiritual and eternal.

Father Goodal. You mean, sister Reed, that it is through these. God teaches us by his word, and approaches our understanding by the medium of our senses, drawing all his illustrations from external nature.

Mr. Payne. Then you would place the testimony of Apostles and Prophets, as the second cause, between the divinity and our spirits, as you place material nature between the Deity and our bodies.

Father Goodal. Not much inclined to theorize on religion or morality, I am averse to all these speculative distinctions, essential to such theories: but in extricating myself from metaphysical mazes on this eternal theme, I say to the curious,—That my conceptions, weak and imperfect as they doubtless are and must be, authorize me only to say, that as my spirit interposes human language between itself and every other spirit on which I will to operate, so I presume from all that appears in the Bible, the Spirit of God interposes between it and my soul the precepts, promises, expostulations, and declarations of the written record, and by these means rouses and energizes me to actions suitable to his will, thus working in me to will and do of his good pleasure. And thus the Spirit convinces, persuades, and comforts men.

Mr. Cunningham. I am now reminded of a curious debate which occurred in Greenock between two celebrated theorists, on a much disputed passage in John. I cannot now mention the chapter or the verse, but it will be found somewhere in John. The Messiah pro-

Digitized by Google

mised to convince the *world* of sin, righteousness, and judgment, by the Comforter. The debate was about the manner in which this conviction was accomplished. I should be thankful for an exposition of that passage from Mr. Reed, or from any of the ladies or gentlemen present: for I am already convinced that it fairly lies within the powers of the present company to set that passage in its true light.

Father Goodal. You had better, Mr. Cunningham, explicitly state the point to be illustrated, and then it will be in a tangible form before the company.

Mr. Cunningham. Indeed, sir, I have it not so distinctly in my mind as to do that; but, in the examination of the whole passage, I may be enabled to recollect the incomprehensible point, which at that time so perplexed myself and all the company.

Mr. Reed. We shall read the passage, and perhaps that may enable Mr. Cunningham to recall the knotty point. It reads as follows:—"I will send you," says the Messiah, "the *parakletos* (advocate,) and having come, he will convince the world of (concerning) sin, of righteousness, and of judgment: concerning sin, because they believe not on me;—concerning righteousness, because I go to my Father, and you see me no more;—concerning judgment, because the Prince of this world is judged."

Mr. Cunningham. Who, let me inquire, is the *Parakletos?*

Mr. Reed. One that pleads for another, or assists another by counsel, is its most common acceptation: literally, one invited or called to assist another.

Mr. Cunningham. But have we no one word in our language which will fairly and fully represent the original term in all its various acceptations?

Mr. Reed. We have our choice of three: *advocate, monitor,* and *comforter.* of these, the first or second will faithfully represent the original in the five places in which the word is found in the New Testament. Perhaps, in our present current meaning of the word *advocate,* it more exactly and fully represents the word in the passage under consideration, than any other.

Mr. Cunningham. But still, the meaning of the word ascertained, let me ask, *who* is the Advocate?

Mr. Reed. The Holy Spirit, undoubtedly.

Mr. Cunningham. Was not the Holy Spirit already in the world and with the Apostles?

Mr. Reed. Not as the *advocate* of the Apostles; for the Father was yet to *give* him: and Jesus says, "When I depart *I will send him to you,* and he will continue always with you." The Holy Spirit is here promised as the perpetual aid of the Apostles in pleading the cause of the Messiah after his departure.

Mr. Cunningham. This I perceive: but with whom was he to plead the cause? When a cause is to be *plead,* there must be, as I conceive, some person accused.

Mr. Reed. Grant it; and was not Jesus accused by the Jews of being an impostor—one that pretended to be the Son of God—having

Digitized by Google

a divine mission? Now as the Apostles were to plead his cause with the accusers, whether Jews or Romans, it was necessary to their success that they should have supernatural aid, as both the person and mission of Jesus was supernatural.

Mr. Cunningham. The *Spirit of Truth* is, then, the advocate of the Apostles, or the advocate of Christ against the world But here, let me ask, Who is this person that appears as "*the Prince of the world?*"

Mr. Reed. The *archon tou kosmou*, or "prince of the world," is first introduced to us by the same Apostle John, chap. xi. 31. Jesus speaking of his approaching end, says, "Now must the world be judged. Now must the Prince of this world be cast out." Again, he says, (chap. xiv. 31.) "The Prince of this world is coming, though he will find nothing in me; but this must be, that the world may know that I love the Father, and do whatsoever he commands me." And in the passage before us he says, "He will convince the world of judgment, because the Prince of the world is judged." We cannot, from these premises infer that Pilate, or Caiaphas, or Cesar, is thus designated. A higher potentate than they, of a more ancient and long protracted reign, must be sought to suit all that is said of this despot.

Mr. Payne. Is not Beelzebub called the *Prince of demons*, and what more fitting than to call the Prince of demons the Prince of the world under control of those demons.

Mr. Reed. The Scribes and some of the Jews called Beelzebub the Prince of demons, but Jesus gave him not this title: he only reasoned with them on their own assumption. Paul, indeed, seems to have spoken of Jupiter, or the chief god of the Greeks and Romans, as *the Prince of the power of the air*, the spirit that then worked in the hearts of the sons of disobedience. But to keep to our scriptural premises, we cannot imagine that Jesus aimed only at the expulsion or dethronement of Pilate, Caiaphas, or Cesar. The dethronement of a higher power is regarded in these words: "Now must the world be judged; now must the Prince of this world be cast out." Paul says, "The *princes* of this world crucified the Lord of glory." But as Satan instigated Judas to betray him into their hands, is it not reasonable to say, that he also instigated the Jewish government to *judge* him worthy of death, and the Pagan Pilate to execute their sentence?

Mr. Cunningham. I would now infer that you make *Satan* himself the Prince of the world, who was to be cast out, dethroned, and judged by the Messiah.

Mr. Reed. You correctly anticipate me. Satan is the Prince of this world, however his subalterns may govern it.

Mr. Cunningham. A difficulty presents itself here. Is not the earth the Lord's, and all the fulness thereof? How, then, can Satan with propriety be called the Prince of the world?

Mr. Reed. The Lord, indeed, is possessor and proprietor of heaven and earth; but this, his rightful sovereignty, Satan has usurped; and

Digitized by Google

because the inhabitants of the earth voluntarily submit to his usurpation, and yield to his dictation, he is properly styled, "*the god of this world*," and "the prince of this world."

Mr. Cunningham. Is it not said in some of those passages which you have quoted, that he came to Christ and found nothing in him?

Mr. Reed. The Saviour said, "The prince of the world is coming, though he will find nothing in me"—alluding to the trial which he was then about to undergo, at the instigation of Satan, in the reigning dynasty of Caiaphas and Cesar. And to this agrees the words of the Prophet—"In his humiliation his judgment [or condemnation] was extorted." They took away his life by violence, without any charge being sustained against him; so that, in truth, he laid it down of himself.

Mr. Cunningham. Are not Pagan magistrates called God's ministers, and did not Jesus lose his life by God's ministers?

Mr. Reed. The institution of civil government is, indeed, of divine origin, and those who attend upon it are God's ministers; but his ministers frequently refuse to execute his laws; and though they retain the office, they only abuse the power entrusted them. Thus the successor of Aaron was the legitimate and divinely instituted high priest of God; yet Caiaphas so far forgot his duty, and hearkened to the counsels of Satan, that he condemned God's own Son. Many a minister of earthly courts has betrayed the cause of his sovereign, and alienated the hearts of the people from their constitutional chief. It is not, then, surpassing marvellous that the kings and princes of the earth should be called God's ministers, though they serve Mammon and Satan rather than God.

Mr. Cunningham. I am now fully satisfied on two points—that the SPIRIT OF TRUTH, or the *Holy Spirit*, is the person promised as the ADVOCATE of the Messiah's claims, and that the PRINCE OF THIS WORLD is Satan, acting through his servants—that great usurper of the throne of God, who seeks to subvert his government, and seduce mankind from their proper allegiance to him as their rightful sovereign. I am therefore prepared to hear you explain the passage in question.

Mr. Reed. That we may do justice to this passage, we must place all the circumstances before us; and in the imagery of the representations given, consider the whole details. We have, then, in the forensic imagery, the greatest of all suits that ever pended before any tribunal, exhibited to us in the views addressed to the Apostles. The litigated question was, *Is Jesus an impostor?* The world is both the accuser and the judge, the Apostles are the defendants, and the Holy Spirit the Advocate. When the one party is both accuser and judge, the other party needs able counsel and an eloquent advocate. Such were the facts;—the world was both accuser and judge; the Apostles were the defenders of the Messiah after his death, and the Holy Spirit was the advocate in the case. And if such were the facts, there is no impropriety in having the matter set before us in the forensic imagery.

Digitized by Google

Placed in this light, all difficulty in the style disappears. While Jesus was on earth the Apostles had recourse to him on every emergency. Now on his removal he promises them a more efficient aid in the advocacy of the Spirit of Truth, and sends them forth amongst his personal enemies, his accusers and judges, to convict them of his righteousness, and *their* unrighteousness, of his victory and their defeat.

The world is to be convinced of its own sin or unrighteousness; of his righteousness, and of the dethronement and utter ruin of him who instigated it to the perpetration of the horrible deed In doing this the Advocate was to plead from three topics—1st. The unbelief of the world: 2d. The justification of Jesus by the heavenly hierarchies: 3d. And the dethronement and punishment of the prince of this world.

Mr. Cunningham. But does not this view of the passage confine its applicability and practical utility to the world that then was—to the cotemporary age, or rather to the persons concerned in the trial then pending in Jerusalem?

Mr. Reed. By no means: for although it primarily applied to them then on the stage in Jerusalem, the meaning, scope, and point of the arguments used are applicable to all ages, and as suitable to conviction now as formerly. But let it be remembered, that the Spirit of God, in the office of the Advocate, however numerous and diversified his arguments may be in convincing the accusers of Jesus of sin, enforces them all by, or concentrates them all in, their unbelief and rejection of him as the Messiah. Unbelief is now the condemnation of the world. To open up this to the understanding of men, by such considerations and suggestions as those tendered by the Advocate, is the only effectual way of convincing mankind of their sin against God. And to develope the resurrection, ascension, and glorification of Jesus, or the manner in which he returned to the Father, his reception into the heavens, is the most effectual way of convincing men of the justice of all his pretensions. To convict the world of the ultimate triumph of the Messiah—of the utter and eternal ruin of Satan—to preach judgment to come with all possible effect—nothing more is necessary than to exhibit in the arguments of the Holy Advocate, how Jesus triumphed in his death over principalities and powers, and in his resurrection from the dead destroyed that most appalling hydra, Death, and vanquished that insatiate monster, the Grave.

He, then, who would successfully plead the cause of the Messiah, must learn the arguments of the Holy Advocate, and plead from the same topics, in all his attempts to convince the world concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment to come.

Mr. Cunningham. Let me ask you another question, which I now remember to have been the burthen of the debate before mentioned. How was the prince of this world *judged?*

Mr. Reed. How was the Prince of Philistina judged, when Sampson, the avenger of Israel, laid his hands upon the pillars of their

Digitized by Google

temple, and bowing in all the greatness of his heaven-born strength, buried himself with their nobles in the ruins of their idolatry? Thus was the prince of this world hurled from his throne. His power began to totter the moment Jesus was nailed to the cross. To this effect speaks Paul, when he says, "He spoiled governments and powers; he made a show of them, openly triumphing over them by his cross." From the instant of his death he put his foot upon the serpent's head; and from the day of his coronation in heaven, he began to wrest from the tyranny of Satan multitudes of our race, and will continue so to do until Death, the last enemy of man, shall be destroyed.

EDITOR.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

SPECULATION.

RESULTS of the present inclination of the axis of the earth to the plane of her orbit:—

1st. Inequality in length of day and night.
2d! do. in heat and cold, spring, summer, &c.
3d. do. in the exhalations, in rain and drought.
4th. do. in fertility of the soil.

5th. Those inequalities subject man to varied sickness, break down the human constitution, and cut short human life.

6th. Those inequalities confine many important productions of the earth within very narrow zones, and hence gives rise to commerce and rival interests, the fruitful causes of *war*.

Was this the primeval condition of the earth? No; because revelation says, (and reason approves,) that God created all things very good. Because originally the earth was watered without rain, and the rainbow was not known. Because the history of the flood justifies the idea, that nature convulsed into chaos ran. Because every part of the earth exhibits signs of its having undergone important and wonderful changes.

Could the poles be elevated to 90 degrees to the plane of her orbit, would notthese results follow under the existing laws of matter?

1st. The days and nights be equal the world over—the year round.

2d. The cold of winter and heat of summer—give place to perpetual spring.

3d. Excessive rains and excessive drought—give place to cloudless days and dewy nights.

4th. Hills and mountains, now washed by the mountain floods, might become fruitful as the vales.

5th. The varied productions of the globe would be more evenly spread over its surface by virtue of the equalization of temperature; and hence a great check be put to commerce and rival interest, the fruitful causes of *war*. Hence man being less exposed to cold and heat, becoming the subject of a less varied climate, would be both more healthy and longer lived. The earth being equally regular and daily watered, would be so highly fertilized as to sustain a much greater number of inhabitants than it now can. The productions of all parts of the earth being nearly alike, an end would be put to those rival interests growing out of commerce, and hence, being but little cause for strife, the nations might "learn war no more."

J. C. A.

Digitized by Google

PROSPECTUS

Of the CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, *to be published at Eastport, Me.*

WILLIAM HUNTER, *Editor.*

The CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR is not designed to add another star to the banner of Sectarianism, nor another sail to the proscriptive armada of Partyism; but, on the contrary, is designed for what its name purports, viz.—to investigate and analyze every thing which may be presented from every quarter for the christian's palate. It will endeavor to present *the gospel* just as it is found in the New Testament, without regard to its agreement or disagreement with the gospels of the sects. It will faithfully investigate and expose the fables and Gentilism which are palmed off on the community for evangelical preaching, sound divinity, &c. and will endeavor to show that no preaching is evangelical save that which agrees with the Evangelists. This attack, however, shall be on *principia non homines*—principles, not men. The Editor will ever bear in mind the wise saying, *Audi alteram partem*—Hear the other party. To this end every person shall have the privilege of presenting his religious views to the public through the columns of the Investigator, as far as its limits will allow, provided he does not outrage common courtesy. To those who desire an apology from us for commencing this work, we have only to say, the present state of christendom will furnish a more eloquent apology than any we can present; the fact that most of the religious periodicals of the present day are known to be more the confined organs of the party, than the open, fearless, and untrammelled heralds of christianity, is a sufficient apology for presenting to the public a *free paper*—one in which every lover of truth may speak without fear or restraint. The writer of this has seen too much of the spirit of Antichrist, both in Europe and America, to make any compromise with him or any of his legitimate progeny. The shore of time has been lined with one continued wreck, containing some of the noblest and purest spirits of every age, because they dared to think, and had the moral courage to avow, that they believed a little more, or a little less, than the party standard—the creed. But while the investigator will always be ready to repudiate all attempts to enslave the disciples of Christ, by fallible, unauthorized creeds of men, it will endeavor to present, and enforce upon *all* —from the King on the throne to the slave in the dungeon—the heaven-born precepts of Jesus Christ. In order to fill up the outlines of the preceding chart, the following subjects will be attended to, viz:—

1st. The divine originality of the Holy Scriptures,—the glorious, transcendent, and incorruptible treasure which they reveal, and the conditions on which all men may enjoy it, will receive more than an ordinary share of our attention.

2d. The imbecility, and incompetency of the sects to regenerate the world.

3d. The impossibility of an answer to Christ's prayer (that all may be one) as long as the sects make a belief of their respective creeds a term of fellowship.

4th. The possibility, probability, and certainty of its answer, if they would only reject their creeds and return to the Bible.

5th. That man's only safety is to believe in, and obey, Jesus Christ as God's anointed King.

6th. The beautiful adaptation, and all-sufficiency of the word of God, not only for the government of his church, but for the conversion and subjugation of the whole world to Jesus of Nazareth.

7th. Give a passing notice to events of the day which are calculated to have a bearing on the liberties of the sons of God, and the spread of the gospel.—In fact, *any* thing which will be consoling and encouraging to the true christian, and *every* thing which will be a terror to evil doers, whether they be in the church or out of it, shall be considered the lawful province of the Investigator.

Digitized by Google

With these general statements concerning the design, and the course which it means to pursue, we commit the Investigator to the wave of public patronage, expecting, and indeed requesting, no support, except from those who honor Jesus more than the petty chieftain of a party,—who prize the incorruptible word of God above a human creed, and who would rather see christians united and happy on the foundation of the Bible, and the world obedient to Jesus Christ, than to see his party rule, christendom distracted, and the world in wickedness.

CONDITIONS OF PUBLICATION.

1. Each number of the work will contain 16 pages, large octavo, printed on paper of a very superior quality, with fair faced type of a suitable size for such a work.

2. The first number will be issued on the first of May next, and every successive number will be regularly issued on the first of each succeeding month.

Terms.—One Dollar per annum, if paid in advance, or, One Dollar and Fifty Cents if payment is delayed until the end of the year. Any person procuring *five* subscribers, and remitting the money for the same, will be entitled to the sixth copy gratis.

N. B. All communications, post paid, directed to William Hunter, Editor, Eastport, Me., will be strictly attended to.

February, 1835.

"ILLHANUS" has been received, containing some strictures on "Parthenos" on marriage. Whatever we might say in behalf of his logic, we can pronounce no eulogium on his style. If the writer would, in a style more worthy of the subject, dress up his logic anew, it might be useful to some of our readers; but it ought to have a more fashionable suit before it appears in public. EDITOR.

From the Religious Souvenir.

MORN.

(In imitation of "Night," by Montgomery.)

BY MRS. J. L. GRAY, OF EASTON.

Morn is the time to wake—
The eyelids to unclose—
Spring from the arms of sleep, and break
The fetters of repose;
Walk with the dewy dawn abroad,
And hold sweet fellowship with God.

Morn is the time to pray—
How lovely and how meet,
To send our earliest thoughts away,
Up to the mercy seat!
Ambassadors for us, to claim
A blessing in our Master's name.

Morn is the time to sing—
How charming 'tis to hear
The mingling notes of nature ring
In the delighted ear!
And with that swelling anthem raise
The soul's fresh matin-song of praise!

Morn is the time to sow
The seeds of heavenly truth,
While balmy breezes softly blow
Upon the soul of youth;
And look to thee, nor look in vain,
Our God, for sunshine and for rain

Morn is the time to shine,
When skies are clear and blue—
Reflect the rays of light divine
As morning dew drops do;
Like early stars be early bright,
And melt away like them in light.

Morn is the time to think,
While thoughts are fresh and free;
Of life, just balanced on the brink
Of vast eternity!
And ask our souls if they are meet
To stand before the judgment-seat?

Morn is the time to die,
Just at the dawn of day,
When stars are fading in the sky,
To fade like them away—
But lost in light more brilliant far,
Than ever merged the morning star.

Morn is the time to rise—
The resurrection morn—
Upspringing to the glorious skies,
On new found pinions borne,
To meet a Saviour's smile divine—
Be such ecstatic rising mine!

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number V.——Volume VI.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. May, 1835.

Reply to a Reformed Clergyman---No. 1.

BY S. M. M'CORKLE, A LAYMAN.

OUR *Reformed Clergyman* says, "But who dares to be dogmatical on the future? Who can say, As sure as there is truth in the Bible, this is the true meaning of prophecy?" My worthy friend has reformed me a little in this matter. Some men have a strong way of expressing their strong conviction about an interesting truth, who, if questioned soberly, would be far from testing the truth of scripture by their exposition of prophecy.

The wretched trash, inconsistencies, and absurdities, which have been palmed on the credulity of the world by the clergy and commentators, as the meaning of prophecy, has contributed no little toward making the Layman dogmatical. Truth is always consistent. God proposes to the faith of man nothing unreasonable. Now, what else but inconsistencies are to be found among the commentators, or contradiction and jargon from the pulpit? Like fingerboards they stand, pointing a hundred different roads to heaven; but go not. A hundred different "Lo, heres!" One in mute silence—another by dint of vociferation, gets to heaven. One with his mourning bench—another with his penances, absolutions, his crucifix, or holy water, &c. Now, we are indebted to the priests, not to the Bible, for all these things. They have applied New Testament prophecies to nations, men, or things—in the church or out of it; Saracen locusts, Goths or Vandals, thunder and lightning, Spanish armada, or a French revolution, the rolling of the heavens together as a scroll, &c. —to the prostration of heathen idolatry!—heathen idolatry by inspiration called heaven!! Anon, they go into the kingdom of nature, and burn *earth, air, and ocean with fire!*—make stars and planets quit their orbits, and, contrary to the laws of attraction, fall to our earth—our little earth, compared to most of them.

These things, with "melted rocks" and such like appendages, they trumpet round the world with their "ram's horn rhetoric;" enlist infinite power in their aid, which is able to do all these things in a

Digitized by Google

moment, though in manifest opposition to the known and established laws of nature. Looking at these things, and comparing them with a system or interpreting the prophecies, and bringing them to concentrate in their accomplishment on a corrupt church, without violating one single law of nature, or the former dealings of God toward the human family. Comparing the two systems, is it surprising that I have been dogmatical?

Our friend thinks the *Layman* has been too unsparing of those great benefactors of mankind, the clergy. When he proves my system of interpreting the prophecies erroneous, the charge will be sustained in part.

I am charged with indiscriminate "slaughter." I surely have made honorable exceptions: he has overlooked this, and has filled his "censer" with the firebrands which I have thrown at the clergy, taking christendom in the aggregate. He says, "All reformers were of this proscribed class." Reformers have universally been a small minority of this class. The mass of the clergy have always been, are now, and will be, the most inveterate and formidable enemies to reformation. "The people spoil them," &c. It was said of old, "The rulers of my people do cause them to err." Now-a-days, our leaders are "spoiled" by those whom they are leading! Suppose we admit the fact; it is not much to the credit of teachers to be spoiled by their pupils! Will they not both fall into the ditch? "All the light and science of Europe—of the world, has come through these accursed priests." This is questionable. Europe is indebted to them for its tithe system, its church establishment, its Purgatory, and *Inquisition, that hell on earth:* and we in debt to the errors of Europe, to men of the world, men of science too, for our freedom from the chains and fetters which have bound the consciences—bound the Old World bond slaves to the clergy. We are in debt to the priests for much of the piety found in the christian world: all its divisions and strife; its millions of martyrs; its racks, dungeons, fires—those irresistible arguments which they have brought into requisition against heresy.

Our friend says, "The Protestant clergy, as a class of men, are the best class in any community."* This, as a ploughman, I am disposed to question. "Place," says he, "a thousand of your best laymen in their place; and if, in three years, they are any better than a thousand of the present priests, then I am no prophet." Place them under like circumstances, under like laws, and they would be like the priests. It would mend the matter but little. Our friend says, "I quarrel with the system, much more than with the men." Now, sir, who fitted out this system, by which priest and people

* Our friend has let the cat out—the true secret how the clergy become "spoiled." Before they get the better of their pupilage, they begin to indulge a silly vain conceit, that they are the "best class in any community;" and the people are just simple enough to admit—yes, cherish their pretensions. Is it a wonder that they are "spoiled?" The system is full of ruin. The Bramins have long practised on it to perfection. Our friend is reformed from being a clergyman, or I would make "a hearty application of the flesh brush" to him on the subject.

Digitized by Google

"spoil" each other? Will you have me saddle it upon the clergy? Suppose we place priest and people under the pure, holy, simple system of government, fitted out to our hand by the Apostles of our Lord and Master: if, in three years, they are not one hundred per cent. better than the present class of priests and people, then "I am no prophet." I am a great stickler for the laws of the King. *His government will always make men better;* and it is a bad system of government which makes men "worse," or which causes them to "spoil" each other.

But I hope our friend may do the most perfect justice to his subject. I wish to see the strongest array of scripture and argument, that can be brought against my system of interpreting the prophecies. I shall not require of him "demonstration," but logical arguments; and if he be a good logician, he may find a shade of difference between his strongest arguments and demonstration. I have nothing to lose in the event. My reputation as a scribbler or theologian is not worth a *button*, compared with important truth.

As a critic, our friend may detect me in some little errors about the length of dispensations, to a year; but it is only the "scaffolding," without affecting the fabric. In this matter he has undesignedly, as I suppose, made me a little more explicit than the text will fairly allow. Alluding to my assertions relative to the length of dispensations, he says, "None of them have lasted *only* two thousand years." The text says, "Longer than *about* two thousand years." They may have lasted a little longer or shorter, but have been dissolved on account of corruption—have been followed by some judgments—have terminated in a day of vengeance. We may with propriety say, that the antediluvian dispensation ended with *the Flood*—was destroyed for, and on account of, corruption. We quote Moses as proof: "And God said to Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them: and behold I will destroy them with the earth."

Relative to the second dispensation, we will quote the Messiah. Speaking to the Jews, he says, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof; for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people; because they know not the time of their visitation."

Our friend says, "The Jewish dispensation lasted only fifteen hundred years, and was dissolved; not only because it was corrupt, but whether corrupt or not, it would have been dissolved and destroyed, as we do the stubble or the straw, when we have got the wheat; or pull down and burn up the scaffolding, when the house is reared." What a tremendous destruction of human beings took place at the pulling down of our Clergyman's "scaffolding!" Had there nothing else suffered but rocks and timber, the Temple and walls about Jerusalem, our friend's reasoning would be plausible enough; but how different the fact? Or how does it comport with God's promise to Solomon? What excuse could have been given for destroying the Jewish dispensation, after stipulating with Solomon if he would be obedient?

"If thou do according to all that I have commanded thee, and will keep my statutes and my judgments; then will I establish the throne of thy kingdom upon Israel for ever," &c. "But if ye shall at all turn from following me," &c. "then will I cut off Israel out of the land which I have given them; and this house, which I have hallowed for my name, will I cast out of my sight."

The fate of the government, of the Temple, and of all its appendages, was suspended upon conditions within the power of the then existing church. "Whether corrupt or not, it would have been dissolved and destroyed." Our friend supports this position with neither scripture nor argument, nor one solitary fact can he bring to the support of his position, from the beginning of God's creation down to the present day. *So has God never done.**

Now will our *Reformed Clergyman* tell us when the Jewish dispensation did commence? We will give him a little latitude, without confining him to the identical year. I, as a common sense man, at a *guess*, would say, that the Jewish dispensation commenced with Abraham, with whom the covenant was made. Abraham probably was born just about two thousand years before Christ. The law was given four hundred and thirty years after the covenant had been made and confirmed with Abraham, "which it could not disannul," &c. Abraham offered sacrifice and performed circumcision these four hundred and thirty years before our friend begins his Jewish dispensation!! If the Clergyman has not made a blunder here, the Layman has.

The Clergyman contends that dispensations have been reformed. Speaking of the one before the Flood, he says, "This [the flood] was a sore judgment, which reformed the world for a while." Who was reformed? What kind of reformation was it, that exterminated the whole human family, save eight righteous souls who needed no reformation? Speaking of the Jewish, he says, "Were they not effectually reformed from idolatry by the captivity," &c. "restored to their own land and their former privileges?"

But a small part of the Jews returned from Babylon; and from their return to the day of their dreadful fall, enjoyed but a short time their former privileges. They were under the Medes and Persians, subjects to the Grecians and Romans. In their captivity they lost their holy fire, the ark of the covenant, and their Urim and Thummim.

As I am fond of analogies, indulge me a little; for I have left the analogy in my essays unfinished. The christian dispensation has its Babylon. A reformation brought out of this *Babylon* but a small part of christendom, with the loss of all the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and this small part governed by Babylonish laws? Like the prototyye, the reformation soon needs reform; and to perfect the analogy, but a small part of the reformed within the reach of reformation.

* Dogmatical again! Bad habits contracted in bad company. I have been a Clergyman's *Elder*, from which I am reformed; but "casks long retain the odor of the first wines," &c. The spirit of the Clergy is sometimes almost too manifest in my essays.

I will here notice our friend's objections to analogies. He says, "They are the most romantic things we can imagine."

I do not pretend to be a logician; but if reasoning from analogy, or that of running parallels, does not come as near demonstration as any other mode of reasoning, the Layman has made another blunder. In similar cases we all expect similar results. Like causes—like effects. And by analogy we judge of the future by the past—judge that Jupiter and Saturn are inhabited—judge that if dispensations have been changed or dissolved, they may again, when a like cause exists—when corrupted, mismanaged, and abused. Our friend says, on these principles we may "infer the fortunes of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh dispensations;" yes, or the seventh hundred, if erring man have the management.

As it respects an analogy between the gospel and the twelve signs of the zodiac, it is visible to none of my senses. His Masonic analogy, or the *sanctum sanctorum*, I know nothing about—therefore, say nothing.*

Our brother believes in a Millennium, the conversion of the Jews, and the destruction of all the corrupt hierarchies on earth—the binding of Satan and a resurrection of the primitive church—of the great, and good, and noble spirits of former times. A church resurrection! Where in the visible or invisible world will he find a precedent for this? On what principle is the resurrection to take place—physical or moral? "Destruction of all the corrupt hierarchies on earth." How many will there be left? Perchance this destruction may close the present dispensation! "Conversion of the Jews." Our brother will not have them converted by sight—has he any new argument or motive to offer them? Have they not been assailed by argument in vain for eighteen hundred years? "They are to be brought in with the fulness of the Gentiles." Think you, that there is to be an increase from the Gentile world after "the fulness of the Gentiles be *come* in?" The meaning of this prophecy is overlooked.

Evidences of the Gospel---No. 1.

THE christian *believes* that God made himself known to all the human race at two of the most memorable periods of human history. The first revelation of himself was made to the family of Adam; the second, to that of Noah. At the commencement of the antediluvian and postdiluvian worlds, all the children of men, the fathers and founders of all nations, were favored with a clear development of the existence and perfections of the Creator and Governor of the World,

* I very well recollect how sensitive I once saw a set of clergy in presbytery, when a layman made some remarks about the impropriety of the reverend gentry going into the Masonic Sanctum Sanctorum. He had a few mutes on his side—the balance belonged to the Sanctum Sanctorum. Have they not crept into every hole this side of *Purgatory*, where curiosity or gold can *lure a human being?*

Digitized by Google

and of the cardinal relations which his rational offspring sustain to him and to one another. This knowledge of God was, in the first ages of the world, transmitted from father to son by oral tradition. It had not, however, passed through many hands, till corrupted by human invention, and metamorphosed by the phantasies of a licentious imagination, it lost its influence on the human heart; and in a few generations it finally degenerated into the nameless mythological idolatries of the Pagan world. So general was this perversion of divine revelation, that, in the year of the world 2000, polytheism almost universally prevailed. This occasioned the call of Abraham from Ur of Chaldea, and gave rise to a new series of divine communications, which were finally embodied and consummated in the Jews' religion. To this revelation the Jewish descendants of Abraham have, for a period of nearly four thousand years, pertinaciously adhered.

This, together with the Christian religion, for fifteen centuries concealed in the types and prophecies of the Mosaic institution, but fully developed by the Messiah and his Apostles, the Deist wholly disbelieves and rejects, alleging that such a revelation is wholly unnecessary and unreasonable, inasmuch as the universe itself and alone, addressed, as it is, to the reason and understanding of man, is all sufficient to teach him the being and perfections of God as creator and preserver of the world—his own origin and responsibilities—his duties—his immortality and ultimate destiny.

The atheistic philosopher of nature, confident in his own speculations, with the assurance of demonstration, affirms that the Christian is a credulous dupe, following a cunningly devised fable, while he compliments the Deist with the title of a fool.

Accosting the Theist, he asks—'How is it, sir, that, by your five senses, and the exercise of your reason on all the varied contents of the volume of nature, you have not learned to spell the name of your God? In what land, and in what language, are the name and perfections of your creator inscribed upon the fowls of the air, the beasts of the field, or the fishes of the sea? If his name is written on the title page of the volume of Nature, possessed by all, why is it not seen and read by all, who have the same five senses and the same intellectual powers? Why is it that all nations create gods for themselves, of every lust and passion, after the model of their own imaginations and propensities, and stupidly adore the stars of heaven, the beasts of the field, or the reptiles of the dust?

Do you direct my inquiries into Egypt, and refer me to the land of the Pharoahs and the Ptolemies for illumination on the excellencies of your Lord of Nature? Their philosophers direct me to the temple of the red heifer, to the marshes of the Nile, or to the gardens of Thebes. They offer me a crocodile, a calf, or an onion.

Dissatisfied with all the science and learning of the Egyptians, do you invite me to the subtle and accomplished Greeks and Romans? I would accompany you to the groves and mountains of their poets—to the retreats of their philosophers—to the forum of their orators;

Digitized by Google

but in Athens I find more gods than men! In Rome, imperial Rome, replete with all the science of the world—in her magnificent Pantheon, consecrated to Olympic Jove and all the inferior gods—could we brush the cobwebs from their faces, and expel the mice and flies that have defiled their persons, we could not in a year learn their names, their amours, intrigues, broils, and battles. It is all imagination—delusion all.'

'In the absence of any proof that man ever *did* arrive at the conviction of one supreme spiritual intelligence from the book of Nature,' continues the Atheist, ''tis vain for you to attempt to demonstrate than man *can*, by the use of his reason, or by all the suggestions of the book of Nature, possess himself of any one of the ideas which are essential to your creed. *That he has never done it, is the best proof that he never can do it.* Were the universe, indeed, offered as a gift to the Deist, on condition that he would produce only one example of the truth of his theory—a single individual, who had by his reason alone, aided by his five senses, and the book of Nature, acquired the idea, or image, or notion of a one Supreme Spirit, he would never possess it; and this is only equivalent to saying that Deism is a fond conceit—a baseless superstructure—an air-built castle, discovered only in the regions of imagination.'

The Christian philosopher, listening to this triumphant Atheist, at this crisis most serenely interposes his dilemma—'You affirm,' Mr. Atheist, says the Christian, 'that the *idea* or the *name* of a supreme spiritual intelligence, called GOD, *did not* enter the human mind by supernatural revelation, and that it *could not* enter the human mind by reason: but the idea and the name are now in the human mind, entertained by millions of the wisest and the best men in the world. Will you, then, please explain to us how this name *God*, and the idea which it represents, first took possession of the human understanding?'

'By *imagination*,' promptly responds the Atheist. 'Who,' replies the Christian philosopher, 'is this god IMAGINATION?—in what heaven does he dwell? He can create out of nothing the idea of one supreme spirit! In what city have you dedicated a temple to this divinity? And is this the perfection of Atheism? Is it compelled to deify the imagination of man, and assign to it the most splendid creations in the universe. *Imagination*, the god of Atheists, creates the God of Christians! I believe not in this divinity, and will not believe in him, unless he can work one miracle at least. Let him create one new idea, or the model of one new idea, and I will believe in him. But it must be a *new* idea. I cheerfully assign to imagination the honor of being the chief artificer in the magazines of all the fine arts. It combines, compounds, new-modifies, and arranges all the materials found in the chambers of our perceptions, reflections, and memories. But as soon will the architect create the materials for the house which he builds, as imagination furnish the materials for its own manufacture. It borrows from the sight, the sound, the taste, the smell, the feel, all the materials from which it fabricates its offerings. In all its patchwork we see how much it is indebted to the five senses;

Digitized by Google

—that it is only *imitative*. If it could create a God, it certainly could furnish man with at least one new sense. But it has been asked in vain to suggest one original idea, and to try its strength in giving a name to a sixth sense. As soon will the voice of the Atheist rend the mountains, as his imagination invent a sixth sense for man, unlike the five with which he is endued.

The Christian has two sources of original ideas: the unbeliever has but one. The Book of Nature and the Book of Revelation furnish the Christian with all his original simple conceptions. For the Book of Nature he is furnished with five senses:—The sense of seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, feeling. His reflections on the objects of sense, and the impressions these objects make on him, furnish him with ideas compound and multiform; but every idea properly original and purely simple, is a *discovery*. Its model, or that which excites or originates it, is found in the volume of Nature, or in the volume of Revelation. Sense fits him for the one, and faith for the other. Every supernatural idea found in the world, as well as the proper term which represents it, is directly or indirectly derived from the Bible.

In drawing this conclusion we use the premises, and work by the rules, of all the mental philosophers of acknowledged orthodoxy in the science of mind and of language. The unbelieving Hume and the believing Locke, alike assent that all our simple and original ideas are derived from sensation and reflection; and that the imagination is absolutely dependent upon the discoveries of the five senses for all its inventions and creations. But the Apostle Paul sanctions these conclusions by affirming that it is "by *faith* we understand that the universe was made by God"—and that "he that comes to God must *believe that he exists:*" for the world by wisdom did not know God.

Some, indeed, have been confounded by such sayings as these:—"The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament shows his handy works"—"His invisible attributes are clearly seen by the things that are made, even his eternal power and divinity; so that the Gentiles are without excuse." These, and such like sayings, constitute no real objection to the views offered: for when the proposition that "*God exists*," or that "*there is a God*," is offered to the mind—the heavens and the earth, with all their riches and glory, fully and satisfactorily prove it. But we affirm that the universe furnishes us not with both the *proposition* and the *proof;* or, in other words, the heavens and the earth are not the proposition and the proof. God himself spoke to Adam, and left him not to guess his origin, though he was more capable of making the discovery than any of his sons. He has, in various manners, and times addressed our race in the language which he taught us, and has never left man without the means of knowing his origin and end; though for his obduracy and ingratitude, he has frequently been given over to an undiscerning mind. When, indeed, the idea is once suggested, the whole universe,-in all its dominions, bears witness to the being and

Digitized by Google

perfections of God. Our dogma, (and it is the only one we now desire to lay before our readers) then, is, that the Creator himself suggests the proposition, and the Universe proves it. *"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."*

EDITOR.

Nashville, March 16, 1835.

Romanism---No. 1.

THE Latin church glories in the name *Roman Catholic*, as if it were given by divine authority, and of indisputable truth and propriety. But, weighed in the balances of Reason and Truth, her pretensions are foolish and vain. Roman Catholic and Particular Universal are of the same propriety. As well might the Church of England call herself *Anglican Catholic*, or that of the Greeks *Greek Catholic*, as that of Rome style herself the *Roman Catholic Church*. She is not the universal sect, and as to the validity of her claims to be the ancient, holy, and apostolic church of Christ, we shall diligently inquire in the present series of essays. Meanwhile we desire to find a proper name for the sect of which we are about to speak. And as we intend the utmost justice to the party into whose pretensions we are about to institute an inquiry, we shall give her the first half of her name, and call her the *Roman* sect, and her system *Romanism*. This is all she is entitled to; and, on the principles of truth and right reason, she can claim no more. To say nothing of the Protestant sects, there are the Greek, the Syrian, the Abyssinian, and the Armenian churches, whose claims to an apostolic character are certainly as well founded as those of the Romanists.

That our readers may have a just conception of the claims of the Roman sect to the title of the only true and Apostolic Church of Christ, we shall lay before them, in order, her leading assumptions:—

1. That Peter was the primate, or head of all the Apostles.
2. That Christ founded the church on Peter, the rock.
3. That Peter founded the first church in Rome, and was the first Bishop of that church.
4. That to Rome, by a divine warrant, belongs the primacy and presidency of the church universal; and that, therefore, the Bishop of the Church of Rome is necessarily the terrestrial head of all earthly churches, and the vicar of Christ. From which assumptions she styles herself, *The First—The Apostolic—The Immutable—The Infallible—The Only Church of Christ, out of which there is no salvation.* Of these we shall take some notice before we attend to her other peculiarities.

The whole controversy on the assumptions already stated, is resolvable into as many *questions of fact*, as there are distinct assumptions. One would hence infer, that it was easy to decide the legitimacy of her claims; and, indeed, so it is, were the subject approached with a due degree of candor and intelligence. If these four assump-

Digitized by Google

tions are founded upon irrefragable evidence, then is the Church of Rome constitutionally all that she pretends to be; but if there be no such evidence—and if, on examination, it shall satisfactorily appear, that these are, in fact, gratuitous assumptions, then is she founded not on simple error, but on falsehood.

We shall therefore examine, one by one, these cardinal assumptions, as we would examine any other historical question of fact. And first, we shall ask on what evidence does the Church of Rome affirm *that Peter was the primate or head of the Apostles?* If Peter was "tho divinely constituted head of all the Apostles, and the divinely constituted centre of all ecclesiastic communion," we may expect to find in the details of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Epistles, a due subordination conceded to him by the other Apostles, as their superior. Now in the *practice* of the Apostles does there appear such a subordination, as clearly and unequivocally to establish the superiority of Peter? 'Yes,' replies the Romanist; 'for—

'1. Immediately after the ascension of the Lord, Peter convoked the whole college of the Apostles, and proposed to them to elect a successor to Judas, (Acts i. 15.) which they accordingly did; and in doing which, they unanimoasly recognized his primacy.'

If their acquiescence in this motion of Peter, and acting upon it, is a proof of the superiority and primacy of Peter; then it must follow, that, in all societies, every one who makes a motion, and carries it through unanimously, is the acknowledged primate of that society. Suppose a church of one hundred and twenty persons were assembled on any occasion, and one of their number propose to have a certain person elected to any office in the gift of that community, to which the whole society agrees; is it thence to be always understood, that the mover of this measure is thereby declared to be the head of that society! If not, where is the argument in this incident in favor of the headship of Peter!

But, on the other hand, we argue, and we think with authority, from this transaction in Jerusalem, against the pretensions of the Romanists; for if Peter had been the head of the church, and the vicar of Christ, why should THEY, and not HE, have appointed two candidates for the vacant office; and even when this step was taken by them, why did not *he* decide, as the vicar of Christ, that Matthias should fill the office, without casting lots for it?—! Peter, in this case, neither convoked the meeting, appointed the candidates, nor decided between the Apostles elect. Where, now, in this affair, is the proof of his primacy?

2. But, again, on the day of Pentecost, he is the chief speaker, and stands forth the most conspicuous of the Twelve. True; but not as chief of the Apostles, or as primate over the college; for they *all* spake with tongues. The people saw no superiority as respected authority; and, therefore, "they said to Peter, and to *the rest* of the Apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Of his precedence in answering the question we shall have occasion to speak more particularly in another part of the argument. Meantime it suffices to the

Digitized by Google

argument before us, that in no one incident on this day, do the other Apostles recognize Peter as their primate or president.

3. So far from the least indication of this kind, we discover in the next most prominent occurrence, that Peter and John are acting *under the direction* of the other Apostles; and we find Christ's vicar sent as a legate upon the business of the church. Instead of Peter, as the president, sending his ministers to act under his authority, he himself is sent by the other Apostles—"For when the Apostles in Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of the Lord, they *sent to them Peter* and John."

4. Again, when the Gentiles were converted by the preaching of Peter, did not the brethren of the Jews call him to an account for it? Was he not censured by the brethren for the liberties he had taken on that occasion? Now was the time for Peter to have asserted his supremacy, and to have commanded obedience, as the primate of all the Apostles, and the vicar of Christ. But, instead of this, he makes his plea of defence on the ground that he had only followed the indications of Heaven—and "what was I," says he, "that I could withstand God"!

5. In the celebrated consultation of all the apostles, elders, and brethren in Jerusalem (Acts xv.) on the question of communion with the converted Gentiles, Peter only opens the discussion, as his manner was, and was followed by Paul and Barnabas; and James decides the whole affair: and as the president of the meeting (which he seems to have been) he speaks last, and presents the propositions which were to be final, and to which they all assented. Peter's name is not once mentioned in the epistle sent from this council; but it rests its claims to universal acceptance upon the fact, not of Peter's signature, but as being the collected wisdom of all present.

6. From the date of these decrees, Peter ceases to occupy the attention of the historian Luke, and Paul seems to engross his whole narrative. A circumstance this surely not very compatible with the honor of the primate of all the Apostles.

7. And as still more declarative of the entire destitution of the Roman plea for the primacy of Peter, in all his Epistles he makes no pretensions to superior authority, and none of his fellow-Apostles, in their epistles, recognize him as their spiritual lord. Paul, indeed, makes mention of him once in one of his epistles, but not as his superior in authority, or as his pope, or father in Christ. On the contrary, he solemnly avers that he received no authority from Peter; and so far from being inferior to him in any respect, either in office or character, he was, while at Antioch, under the painful necessity of reproving Peter—of "*withstanding him to the face*," because he was worthy to be blamed.

Such are the evidences which the New Testament furnishes in favor of the primacy of Peter; from which the intelligent reader is left to infer how much the Apostles and first Christians practically conceded to him, as head of all the churches. May we not, then, affirm, with with all the authority of apostolic testimony, that the fundamental

Digitized by Google

position on which the supremacy of the successor of Peter is based, is a gratuitous assumption, alike destitute of reason and scriptural authority? EDITOR.

Steam Boat Ohioan, March 6, 1835.

Dr. Fishback's Book---No. 2.

THE most uncandid thing in the Doctor's book, is his repeated efforts to affix upon the disciples of Christ the stigma of disparaging the sacrifice of the Son of God, by substituting a gospel ordinance for the blood of the New Institution. "*Belief in something, and in baptism in order to remission, and obedience by baptism, or by immersion,*" says he, "secures the remission of *their* sins, or justifies them as sinners without the blood of Christ." And, he adds, "Remission of sins, in their judgment, is, by divine appointment, suspended upon faith and the act of immersion, to the exclusion altogether of the sacrificial death, and expiatory offering of the body and blood of Christ." A more reckless and unfounded calumny was never penned, as far as known to me. I neither know nor acknowledge any man as a christian brother, who teaches or practises such principles.

We have published and republished, from Dan to Beersheba, that faith, repentance, and baptism, without "the sacrificial death and expiatory offering of the body and blood of Christ," however sincere and scriptural they may be, are not worth more than a blue bead in the affair of remission of sins, or acceptance with God. And I have yet to be introduced to the first evangelist in these United States, who preaches faith, repentance, reformation, baptism, as of any value without the acknowledgment and cordial reception of the blood of Christ, as the only procuring and efficient cause of remission.

Another very uncandid thing in the aforesaid book, is an effort, on the part of the Doctor, to make immersion a mere bodily act. When we speak of the *act* of immersion, we always have the *baptizer*, and not the *baptized*, in view. The immersed person performs no bodily act—*does no work* in immersion. He gives up his dead body to be buried; dead, indeed, because of sin. It were absurd to speak of the act of burial, as respected the dead body. The person who deposites the dead body in the grave, acts; but the buried person acts not at all. In being born, in being immersed, and in being buried, the subject is *always passive*. No one is born, immersed, or buried by his own work. This *fact* alone explodes all those parts and parcels of the Doctor's book, in which he talks about justification by works in reference to immersion. A person who understands what he says, cannot preach baptism for remission and justification by any bodily act, or by any work whatever, unless he calls faith, or the determination of the mind, a work. He that believes the gospel, repents of his sins, and *is* immersed, (not immerses himself) if justified at all, must be justified by faith; for faith is the only act of the mind in the case. Faith leads him to the blood of Christ through the water appointed

Digitized by Google

by the Saviour himself. "God," says Paul, "has saved us, not by works of righteousness which we had done; but according to his mercy by the bath of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit."

If believing a promise be not a work of righteousness, immersion is not. The mind only is active in believing and in being immersed. And if any benefit be received in immersion, it is received by faith terminating upon the death, burial, and resurrection of the Messiah. Justification by faith, and immersion, in order to the enjoyment of salvation, are in no respect more incompatible with each other, than grace and faith—than faith and the blood of Christ—or than faith and repentance. The Doctor will not preach faith without repentance in order to forgiveness. Now, be it observed, that by all the arguments which he uses to show that the necessity of repentance, in connexion with faith, changes not the principle of justification; we will demonstrate that the necessity of immersion, in order to the enjoyment of remission, interferes not with the doctrine of justification by faith. This, indeed, has been already done; but neither the Doctor, nor any other opposer of reformation, has attempted to show that in our reasonings there is any error. There is no more incompatibility between faith and immersion, than between faith and repentance, faith and grace, faith and the blood of Christ, in the affair of personal justification or remission.

On the *new birth* the Doctor is hyper-metaphysical. John iii. 5. may mean, does mean, faith alone. "*That true faith in Christ means the same thing with being born of the Spirit, I think the gospel abundantly proves.*" p. 190. And that *born of water* means *born of the Spirit*, is, to him, most probable. Water is the figure of the Spirit; and therefore, Jesus meant born of Spirit and born of Spirit, or "except a man be born of the Spirit, even of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God"! John Gill and John Calvin are quoted in support of these views. The Doctor seems to have been driven to the highest latitudes—to have twice doubled the Cape of Good Hope—and once, if not twice, entered the antarctic regions, to find some *terra incognita*, where he might settle a new colony of ideas, rather than coalesce with the citizens of the temperate zone.

He seems not to have noticed that the new birth was first preached to a *believer*—to one that recognized the divine mission of the Messiah—indeed, to a *disciple* of Christ, though a member of the Senate of the Jews. It was to him that said, "Master, we regard you as a teacher sent from God; for no one could do those miracles which you do, unless God were with him." I say, it was to this possessor of faith in Jesus, that he preached the necessity of being born of water and of the Spirit.

As to John Calvin, he was deserted in his theory on John iii. 5. by all the distinguished reformers, by the Westminster Divines, and is not sustained by any one primitive writer of the first four centuries. John Gill is no authority with any intelligent critic in christendom in any matter of this sort. If any one is curious for authorities, he will

Digitized by Google

find a host of them in the forthcoming "CHRISTIANITY RESTORED," to which we would refer the Doctor.*

If a morbid sensibility for the disobedient had not beclouded the horizon of our friend Fishback, he never could have been found in the ranks of Quakers on spiritual regeneration, nor in the service of them who make void the word and ordinances of Heaven by human traditions. He would not, but for some meteor of the night, have been dazzled out of his usual discernment, and been bewildered in finding a hiding place for disobedient Gentiles, by turning their attention from the ancient gospel to the fables of the 17th century, and flattering them into the opinion, that they may enter into the full enjoyment of remission, and find as much peace and happiness in not doing, as in doing, what Peter commanded his audience, who first sought admission into the kingdom of heaven.

EDITOR.

BETHANY, *Brooke Co. Va* May, 1835.

J. R. HOWARD,

Respected Brother—Your letters of the 18th and 20th February, have been put into my hands, as containing some matters for publication, which I have arranged in the following order, upon which I shall, in my son's absence, offer a few responsive remarks; not intended, however, to supersede any thing that he may think proper to add, at his return, after their publication.

I feel the rather disposed, in the mean time, to use this discretionary power, seeing you refer to my sentiments upon the vicarious nature of the sufferings of Christ, published in the 4th volume of the Millennial Harbinger, which, it seems, have induced you to suppose, that I consider them intended to appease the Father's wrath against sinners;—a mistake which I most earnestly desire to obviate, as nothing appears to me a more direct and express contradiction of the fundamental principle,—yea, of the very first and moving cause of man's salvation; namely, "the great love of God, wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins." Eph. ii. 4, 5. How such a mistake could have originated from any thing contained in the pieces referred to, I cannot easily imagine. But of this in its proper place. I now proceed to the arrangement.

In the former of the above letters, you express a wish to see an essay in the Millennial Harbinger upon the sacrifice of Christ and baptism, showing the connexion between them; and quote various passages of scripture as relevant to said purpose, to which I shall attend in the proper place. Moreover, you desire that said essay should exhibit the "philosophy and necessity" of such a connexion in the divine procedure, for governmental purposes. In the latter—you propose the following queries: viz:—

1st. Are the sufferings of Christ vicarious?

2d. If so, how, or in what sense, are they vicarious?

3d. Were they to appease the wrath of the Father against sinners?

4th. How are his sufferings and death to affect sinners?

5th. As our Saviour is the end of the law, has he not, in taking that law out of the way by his death, conferred a great temporal benefit upon sinners, none of whom could enjoy the present life under it?

Are not all sinners enjoying his temporal favor in this way?—Is not this the way he suffered for *them?*—Or, is it the way opened by his sacrifice alone, which is to draw *them?* You allege that "clear and correct views upon the subject of the above queries, are much wanted among the disciples." I shall

* See the Extras on Remission, as enlarged and improved, in the "Connected View

Digitized by Google

only add,—I am sorry to hear it; and hope it is the case with but a few, who have not duly attended to the *Apostles'* doctrine. In the last place you suggest grounds for a query concerning baptism—viz. Whether or not it is a church ordinance?—Assigning as a reason, the allegation of some that it is so, for the purpose of opposing it as an ordinance of divine appointment for the remission of sins. To each of the above queries I shall attend with all convenient brevity, after a few brief remarks upon the subject of the proposed essay.

Most of the scriptures you have quoted to evince a constitutional connexion between the sacrifice of Christ and baptism, are express to the purpose; others strongly imply it. The first of these—John iii. 5. expressive of the indispensable necessity of a second birth, is, no doubt, intimately connected with verse 14th of the same context, which strongly affirms the indispensable necessity of the lifting up of the Son of Man, in order to the salvation of sinners; without the belief of which no one ever was, or can be, born of water and Spirit; for it is only he that believes this, that is qualified for baptism—for such alone it is appointed: see Mark xvi. 16. with 1 Cor. xv. 1—4. Hence we infer the intimate and indispensable connexion between the sacrifice of Christ and baptism. And as it is faith in the lifting up, or crucifixion of the Son of Man, that qualifies and disposes for baptism—so the Apostles principally insist upon this all-important theme; compare 1 Corinthians ii. 2. with xv. 4, and 11, which "many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized;" see Acts xviii. 8. Hearing what?—Why,—the Apostles' doctrine; viz.—that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. For the Apostle from his first coming to Corinth, had "determined to know," i. e. to make known, as gospel "among them, nothing but Christ, and him crucified;" by the belief of which he declared them saved, provided they retained it, and did not apostatize. Also, that in his manner of preaching he was not singular; for so preached all the Apostles: see verse 11. above quoted. These things being so, there can be no doubt about the intimate connexion of baptism with the sacrifice of Christ.

But if the supposed connexion be evidently implied in John iii. 5, 14. as appears by the above quotations, it is most explicitly evident in those that follow: see Rom. vi. 1—10. Col. ii. 10—13. Heb. x. 22. 1 Pet. iii. 18—22. 1 John v. 6—12. In these scriptures, baptism is expressly connected with the sufferings of Christ—with his bloodshedding, death, burial, and resurrection; and with it—the remission of sins—a resurrection with Christ to a new life—the consequent obligation to a continued course of holy self-denying obedience—and, ultimately, the blissful certainty of eternal life. In the last of the above, viz. 1 John v. 6. "the water and the blood" are in juxta-position, as being the two great comprehensive means, efficient of the grand and all-important design of Christ's coming; namely, "to save his people from their sins;" these being the only typical abluents of moral pollution from Adam to Christ:—the former, viz. "the water," for the purification of the character; that is, of the disposition and practice, from the defilement of sin; the latter, viz. "the blood," to purify the conscience from its guilt—*this*, being emblematic of the efficient cause of our justification—*that*, of the efficient cause of our sanctification, as these terms are generally understood; and which, taken together, amount to a complete salvation from the immediate effects of sin; namely, guilt and depravity. See Col. ii. 10—13. as above; and from which, in this life, Christ came to save his people. Wherefore, in coming for this purpose, he is said to come by, or in the exhibition and use of, the divinely appointed means of water and blood; the *latter*, he shed to redeem us;—the *former*, he afterwards appointed for the believing subject with the promise of this salvation, in order to his enjoyment of it;—to the truth of which the Holy Spirit is the attested witness, as being the truth or substance of the promised blessing—in, and to, the believer; for he that believes has the witness in himself; that is, the truth or thing witnessed; namely, that "being washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of God; 1 Cor. vi. 11. he is become a saved character—"a habitation of God through

the Spirit;" having in himself the good seed and principle of eternal life—the Word and the Spirit. Now that the Apostle is here speaking exclusively of the power of the Christian faith, and not at all of the evidence or certainty of it, of which he had so conclusively spoken at the opening of the Epistle, is demonstrable from the scope and tenor of the whole passage under consideration, from the 4th to end of the 12th verse.—"This is the *victory* that *overcomes* the world, even our *faith*. Who is he that *overcomes* the world, but he who *believes* that Jesus is the Son of God? This is he who came by water and blood—Jesus the Christ;—not by water only, but also by blood; and it is the Spirit that bears witness, because the Spirit is the truth.—He that believes on the Son of God, has the witness in himself:"—namely, "that God has given to us eternal life, and that this life is in his Son;" of which the inhabitation of the Spirit is the principle, as well as the pledge and evidence; see John iv. 14. and vii. 39. with Eph. iv. 13, 14.

Thus the connexion between the sacrifice of Christ and Christian immersion being evidently established, both by the implicit and express testimony of the Holy Scriptures, what more is necessary to instruct and establish our faith, and direct our practice? And, as faith and practice comprehend the whole of christianity, and are the proper and immediate result of law and testimony, upon which alone they can and must be founded, what need of a philosophic display of the necessity of their order and connexion, to evince their consistency with the governmental purposes of God? Such knowledge may, perhaps, be too high for us; or, if attainable, might possibly puff us up: for "knowledge puffs up;" but faith, by love, builds up. Besides, our faith and obedience must not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the authority and veracity of God. Wherefore, the Apostles did not deal in speculating and theorizing, but rather in dictating and dogmatizing; for their object was to teach duty,—not science. Hence, Paul, in addressing the fastidious Grecians, did not avail himself of an eloquent display of philosophic wisdom, in declaring the testimony of God; but, with great plainness of speech, contented himself with declaring the things of the Spirit, in the words of the Spirit; being divinely instructed so to do, lest his success should be ascribed to his eloquence, and so the cross be robbed of its glory—see 1 Cor. 1st and 2d chapters. Nor, indeed, does he ever mention philosophic science in his epistles, but in terms of high disapprobation and disgust, warning the churches against it.—Nay, truly, if we would defecate christianity from the impurities of vain imaginations, and scientific speculations, we must content ourselves with criticizing and scripturizing our style, our sentiments, and our manners, till we modify and reduce the whole to the original purity of the divine standard, in thought, word, and deed. Thus we shall have done with the many ignorant and impertinent questions, and strifes of words; from which proceed envy, contention, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings, &c. &c. "But thou, O man of God, avoid these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness;—fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life," &c. 1 Tim. vi. 4, 11, 12. Now, all this, blessed be God, we can do without any human aid, by the simple study and practice of the pure word of life. And if we will not be directed and influenced by *this*, we would not be persuaded, though one arose from the dead. So much for the first item; we now proceed to the queries:—

Query 1. Are the sufferings of Christ vicarious?—That is, were they endured in the stead, and for the sake, of sinners? For answer to this, we refer the querist to the 4th volume of the Millennial Harbinger, No. 10, pages 503—509, and No. 11, pages 548—553. We do this the rather, because he refers to these communications in the letter containing this query. And also because, that since the publication of said communications in confirmation of the vicarious sufferings of the Saviour, no disciple of the present reformation, nor, indeed, of any party known to the writer, has suggested a doubt or objection relative to the scriptural truth and propriety, of the sentiments they exhibit. And still, *more especially*, do we make this reference, because the

Digitized by Google

numbers referred to, are yet in the hands of the readers of this work, by the reperusal of which they will be in complete possession of our views upon this all-important subject, with the scripture documents upon which they are founded!

Query 2. If the sufferings of Christ be vicarious, how, or in what sense, are they so? We answer, they are so in the proper and established acceptation of the term; that is, by special agreement, in the room and behalf of others, for special purposes. For thus did Christ suffer by the special appointment of the Father; that, through his sufferings, believing penitent sinners might, in a consistency with the divine justice, truth, and holiness, be exempted from sufferings. This position, we think, we have scripturally illustrated and confirmed, in the above cited communications, to which we would again refer the querist.

Query 3. Were they to appease the wrath of the Father against sinners? We answer in the negative—They were not:—but were, indeed, the fruit of the Father's love, to a guilty perishing world.—For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son to be lifted up—that whosoever believes in him, might not perish, but have eternal life. John iii. 14, 15, 16. This declaration of the Saviour determine, for ever, the negative of the proposition contained in the above query. Besides, the affirmative would imply an absurdity; for how, in the nature of things, is it possible to conceive, that vicarious sufferings could reconcile a virtuous mind to malefactors? Could such sufferings change their character, or mitigate their crimes? Surely, no. And if we should even consider them as penitent, it could not alter the case; for, still, such sufferings could neither affect their character, nor their conduct. But what farther need for argument, after the aforesaid declaration of the Son of God? If his testimony does not settle this point, we would not be persuaded, though one arose from the dead. And so we say of all matters of moral and religious obligation. What a pity!—to find the Methodist Episcopal Church, asserting, in the second article of its creed, such a shocking, antiscriptural absurdity, so derogatory to the divine character, and in direct contradiction to the divine testimony; viz. that "Christ truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us," &c. Instead of saying amen to this blasphemous position, we say God forbid that we should impute such a thing to our immutably holy and benevolent heavenly Father, with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.

Query 4. How are his sufferings and death to affect sinners? *Ans.* They are to redeem and reconcile them to God. "For God commends his love to us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Thus,—"When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." For God was in, or by Christ, reconciling the world to himself—making him, who knew no sin,—a sin-offering for us; that we might be made" (partakers of) "the righteousness of God in, or by him"—"who has redeemed us to God by his blood"—having borne "our sins in his own body on the tree—by whose stripes we were healed," &c. See Rom. v. 8—10. 2 Cor. v. 19—11. Rev. v. 9. 1 Pet. ii. 24.

Query 5. This query, predicated upon "Christ's being the end of the law," contains four specifications; see page 1st of this communication. To these we shall attend in their order ——*Specification* 1. "As our Saviour is the end of the law, has he not, in taking that law out of the way, by his death, conferred a great temporal benefit on sinners, none of whom could enjoy the present life under it?" To this we answer in the negative. Christ is not so the end of the law, as to put an end to its authority; for in so doing he would be the end of the law for unrighteousness: whereas, he is the "end of the law for righteousness;" for he came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to establish them, by fulfilling the typical prefigurations of the former, and the verbal predictions of the latter, respecting himself: and so to make atonement for the transgressions of the moral and religious dictates of both. It was in this way, and by his so doing, that he is become the end of the law for righte-

Digitized by Google

ousness, or justification to every believer. He has, therefore, only so far taken the law out of the way by his death, that its penalty shall not so affect any believing penitent sinner, as to detain for ever under it him, who, in order to escape the impending vengeance, flies for refuge to lay hold on the hope of the gospel, by taking the benefit of the act of salvation, for the remission of sins, passed in favor of all such characters. See Mark xvi. 16. with Acts ii. 38. It is in this sense, and for this blissful and holy purpose, that Christ has become the end of the law to every one who believes; and not that sinners might live without law, sin with impunity, and so continue to enjoy the blessings of the present life. No. He came to save sinners *from* their sins, not *in* their sins. But what are we saying? Is it not absurd to talk of sinners without law? Indeed, where there is *no law*, there can be *no transgression*. It was not this way, however, that Christ came to finish transgression, to make an end of sin; i. e. by putting an "end to law;" but by the "sacrifice of himself." "We do not, then, make void the law through faith. Nay, we establish the law."——*Specification* 2. "And are not all sinners enjoying his temporal favor in this way?" That is, in not being under the law in consequence, or by virtue of the death of Christ. We have just observed 'that it would be absurd to talk of sinners where there is no law;' and would it not be quite as absurd to talk of sinners enjoying the divine favor by being left to live and die peaceably in their sins? Better for them they had never been born.——*Specification* 3. "Is not this the way in which he suffered for *them*?" That is, was it not to this effect—for this purpose? We answer, *No*. For men lived longer and stronger before the flood, and for a thousand years afterwards, than they have done since the death of the Saviour. Moreover, to suppose that Christ died for sinnnrs, that they might live in sin with impunity, would be superlative blasphemy against both the Father and the Son.——*Specification* 4. "Or is it the way opened by his sacrifice,—by his blood alone, which is to draw *them*?" *Ans.* There is but one end of Christ's sufferings—that is, the glory of God in the salvation of sinners; and but one way of coming to the enjoyment of that salvation; that is, "the obedience of faith." Rom. xvi. 25, 26. Upon the whole, be it observed—and with all respect to the querist—that had he quoted the whole verse, Rom. x. 4., we should have never heard of his 5th query—"For Christ is the end of the law for *righteousness* to every one that *believes*."

Query 6. Is baptism a church ordinance? This query, we understand, was elicited by the opposition of some of the Baptists, to the administration of immersion for the remission of sins; alleging that immersion is a church ordinance; and of course, that the unregenerate, or persons whose sins are not remitted, have no right to it.—In order to a correct scriptural answer to the above query, we would wish to know what the alleged opponents mean by a church ordinance. Do they mean an ordinance ordained for the church's sake? If so, we might answer extensively in the words of the Apostle,—"All things are for your sakes." And again, "All things are yours." 1 Cor. iii. 21—23. and 2 Cor. iv. 15. In some sense, therefore, baptism belongs to the church—is for the church's sake;—as the divine ordinance of natural birth belongs to families, and is for their sakes; for there could be no families without it. But it would be strange logic hence to infer, that no one had a right to be born, who was not a member of a family! Were this the case, there would soon be no families. Nay, rather, we should never have heard of any. If, however, by a church ordinance, is meant one appointed for the observance and edification of the members:—we challenge christendom to show us in the New Testament a single instance of a church attending upon, or being exhorted to attend to, the ordinance of baptism—Or so much as one unbaptized individual saluted as a disciple, a christian; or as belonging to a christian church. Till this can be done, all human *say-so* is of no more account, than the pretensions of Mahomet. On the contrary, instead of baptism's being appointed for the saved, the pardoned, it is appointed for, and recommended to, such as would be saved—as felt their need of pardon. Compare Mark xvi. 16. with Acts ii. 38. and xxii. 16. with Col. ii. 11—13. In order to a correct

Digitized by Google

understanding of any divine ordinance, there are four things we should strictly observe concerning it; viz—the intention, import, effects, and consequences, divinely ascribed to it;—in short, whatever the scripture declares concerning it. If we do this in relation to the ordinance of immersion as exhibited in the New Testament, whether by the ministry of John, or afterwards by the Apostles of Jesus, we shall find it exhibited—

1st. By both, for the purpose or intention of the remission of sins. Mark i. 4. Acts ii. 33. and xxii. 16.

2d. And afterwards, by the appointment of the Saviour for salvation. Mark xvi. 16. 1 Pet. iii. 21.

3. It is subjoined to faith and repentance, Mark xvi. 16. Acts ii. 38. as the immediate duty and privilege of the believing penitent sinner—for the enjoyment of salvation through the remission of his sins, Luke i. 77. and the reception of the Holy Spirit, Acts ii. 38, 39.

4. There is ascribed to it purification from moral pravity or pollution. 1 Cor. vi. 11. Eph. v. 25—27.

5. Insertion into the body of Christ. 1 Cor. xii. 13.

6. The assumption of his name or character. Gal. iii. 27.

7. An implantation into his death, burial, and resurrection. Rom. vi. 3—7.

Hence, it evidently imports, that the proper subjects of it are guilty, polluted, dead, *without* Christ—not *in* him:—and also suppeses that they are divinely aroused to a sense of their desperate condition, through the exhibition of the gospel, and so brought to faith and repentance, which qualifies and disposes them for the reception of baptism, in order to the enjoyment of the proposed salvation, through the blood and spirit of Christ. The happy and blissful effect and consequence of which is, that thus, "having their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and their bodies washed with pure (that is, purifying) water, they can draw near to God with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, through their great High Priest, by the new and living way, which he has consecrated for them. Thus are they brought into a safe and happy condition through baptism, with its scriptural adjuncts—faith, repentance, &c. &c. Now if these opposing Baptists, who claim baptism as a church ordinance, be in the predicament supposed and implied in the above scriptural exhibition of the intention and import of this ordinance previous to the reception of it; or consider it their duty and privilege to salute, as brethren, those that are so, their case is truly pitiable; for they are nothing better than poor, guilty, miserable, perishing sinners.———Yours, respectfully, T. C.

Change of Heart, of Conscience, and of State.

IT is the fate of those who advocate the ancient gospel and order of things, to suffer and labor under many misrepresentations. These, where they do not originate in prejudice and dishonesty, are generally to be ascribed to the want of a clear and definite expression of our views by ourselves, and a misconception and misunderstanding of them by others. Our views are *misapprehended*, and the consequence is, that we are *misrepresented*; for misrepresentation is generally the offspring of misapprehension. Our opponents and those who dissent from us, being under the influence of their own peculiar views, measure our system by their own; and applying *one* part of theirs to *another* and *dissimilar* of ours, are thus guilty of misrepresentation. In order to arrive at TRUTH, they should bring their systems to the Living Oracles, and measure and test them *there*.

It is particularly in our views about the nature and design of Christian baptism, and the place we assign it in the divine economy,

Digitized by Google

that we are misapprehended and misrepresented. We are charged with teaching that a *change of heart* is not requisite or necessary *before* baptism, and that baptism *changes* the heart; also, with baptizing without faith, repentance, and a change of heart: thus making regeneration consist in immersion *alone!*—than which nothing is more at variance with our real sentiments. We are as far from believing or teaching, that regeneration consists in immersion *alone*, as in "faith *alone*," or repentance, or reformation *alone*. We take the *whole* scheme of the New Institution in *all* its parts; and, professing to make the Living Oracles our *only* guide and directory in all matters of faith and practice, we could not otherwise, and be consistent in our profession. We consider the *whole* plan, in *all* its parts, as *essential* to its perfection and completion, and as necessary to make man perfect and fit for heaven; and that whatever alters the meaning or changes the manner of a single form, or weakens and nullifies a single principle, is as much to be deprecated and avoided as any additions or appendages which would impiously and profanely attempt to supply its supposed deficiencies, or aid its operation and efficiency.

We are charged, as I have observed, with denying a change of heart before baptism—of teaching that that change is effected in baptism—and of immersing before that change takes place. The misapprehension of our sentiments here is a very usual and common one. We teach *baptism for the remission of sins:* those who dissent from us teach a *change of heart for remission*, or that remission is involved, issues in, or is the consequence of, a change of heart; and hence they represent us as teaching *baptism for a change of heart?* We agree with them in the *effect*, (remission) but we differ in the *causes*, (baptism and a change of heart.) They will have us to differ in effects as well as in causes, and to make *their* cause *our* effect; a most illogical, unphilosophical, and erroneous mode of reasoning!

We believe as fully as any in a "change of heart" or mind before baptism; but we believe it to be the result of the gospel duly understood and believed. We do not look upon it as a change resulting from some mystical, physical, undeniable operation, in which the "gospel of Christ, the power of God to salvation," is stripped of its power, and left little or nothing to do in the process of regeneration; but—as a *rational* change—a change which, like other changes, takes place in accordance with the acknowledged laws of the human mind. It is a change in the motives and desires that actuate the mind and control its faculties; that eradicate and remove those that are sinful, and implant those that are holy, just, and good. It is a *change* or transition from one *state* of the mind to another; not a *transformation* of its faculties. There is no creation of *new* faculties in the mind, and annihilation of *old* ones; no communication of new passions and affections in addition to those previously existing. These all remain the same. Man has the same temperament and organization of mind after this change that he had before. The change consists in giving a *new direction* to the faculties, affections, and passions, by having *new objects* presented to them; in thus

Digitized by Google

drawing them into new aims, pursuits, and endeavors. And as it is a change of the heart or mind, it cannot be effected by *baptism*, but by something else, and through some other means. This means we believe to be the testimony of the Spirit, as exhibited in the Living Oracles. There is an essential difference between the effect which testimony and ordinances are designed to have on man; so that one cannot be substituted for, or made to perform the office of, the other. One of the immediate effects of the divine testimony believed is conviction of sin—a guilty conscience: whereas the immediate effect of the ordinance of baptism received is remission of sins—a clear or justified conscience. By the former, the unregenerate are convicted; by the latter, they are converted—pardoned—saved. So that the testimony believed prepares the mind for the reception of those blissful privileges, which the ordinances are intended to convey. Testimony, by the arguments and inducements which it presents to the mind, invites man to *religious action*, which is performed in submitting to, and attending upon religious ordinances. Thus the whole plan of the New Institution is consistent with itself and its design;—to fit and prepare man, by affecting his mind and his conduct for the highest possible enjoyment of himself on earth, and supreme felicity in heaven.

The change of heart or mind which is so indispensably necessary and requisite to prepare the person for immersion—the consummating act in regeneration, must be thorough and complete. The man who was filled with the love of sin, now loathes and abhors it. He was filled with the spirit of disobedience and rebellion to the government of Messiah;—he is now filled with the spirit of obedience and submission. I have said that this change is effected by the testimony of the Spirit; that is, a *belief* of, or *faith* in, that testimony, by a reception of it into the mind as the truth. And now mark the language of the Holy Spirit. Paul, in his letter to the Romans [10th chapter] after distinguishing between the "justification which is by the law," and that "which is by faith," says, "If you shall openly confess with your mouth, that Jesus is the Lord, and *believe* with your HEART, that God raised him from the dead, you shall be *saved*. Because with the HEART man *believes to justification*, and with the mouth confession is made to *salvation*." For the benefit of the advocates of the "faith alone" system, I will quote another part of the same chapter, a little farther on, where Paul is referring to the alien Jews—"Nevertheless, all have not *obeyed* the gospel; for Isaiah says, Lord, who has *believed* our report?" Obedience is inseparable from, and the test of, that faith which justifies, and by which remission of sins is received; for, in the language of the Apostle James, "faith *without works* is *dead*, being ALONE." In the same epistle to the Romans, Paul tells them, that "though ye were the servants of sin, yet you have *heartily obeyed* [or obeyed from the heart] that mould of doctrine to which you have been given up." The sacred writings every where teach that all acceptable obedience, worship, and adoration of God, must be done with the *heart* as well as the *understanding*—and

Digitized by Google

the Prophet's words, which the Saviour applied to the Jews, "This people honor me with their *lips*, though their *heart is estranged* from me,—describe a class of the nominal worshippers of God, whose service is neither accepted nor rewarded. The *faith* or *belief* of which I am speaking, and which is inseparable from the heart, is the effect of *testimony*. "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God;" or, to abbreviate the expression, faith comes by hearing the word of God. "The *sword* of the Spirit is the word of God," says Paul to the Ephesians, when speaking of the Christian armor; and in exhorting the Hebrews not to apostatize, he describes to them the great power and important office of the word. "For the word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of the soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a *discerner* of the *thoughts* and *purposes* of the HEART." The same Apostle tells the Roman brethren, that he is "not ashamed of the *gospel;* because it is the POWER of God to *salvation*, to every one that BELIEVES;" and the Corinthians, "By which also you are SAVED, if you *retain* those joyful tidings, which I have delivered to you." Numerous other testimonies might be adduced, equally as clear, conclusive, and convincing, to prove that the word of God is sufficient to produce the full measure of faith and repentance, without any other aids from the Spirit; and to contend that other aids are necessary, or that the word is powerless until some special application of it be made, is to strip God of his glory and honor, which he has exhibited in this grand display of his converting power, and is to argue that he has either not given man sufficient testimony, or testimony not strong enough, to predicate his faith upon, or that he has not given him sufficient capacity to believe it without other aids, either of which would be charging a defect upon Infinite Wisdom and Power.

In connecting the testimonies I have cited, I have endeavored to show the inseparable connexion between *faith* and the *heart*;—and that the word of God, as exhibited in the Living Oracles, is the instrument by which the Holy Spirit operates on the alien or sinner. As the sword of the Spirit, it circumcises the heart, slays its enmity to God, and countervails all its evil motives, desires, and incitements; and thus makes the Holy Spirit the author of the change of heart. Every man who believes, repents, and reforms, in the sense for which I am contending, experiences this change; and the measure or strength of his faith is sufficient, when his belief in the divine testimony is strong enough to make him act, or do what it enjoins, and he has repented enough, when his sorrow for sin induces him to break off from it, abandon its practice, and thoroughly reform.

But there is something yet wanting, and without which all his faith and repentance will avail him nothing, while he wilfully goes no further;—viz. *a change of conscience.* A load of guilt rests upon his conscience, which must be removed before he can become a fit temple for the residence of the Holy Spirit, with all its fruits of love, and joy, and peace. This heavenly visitant cannot dwell in the same

Digitized by Google

bosom with guilt. The penitent has a *guilty conscience.* He seeks for a good one; and where and how shall he obtain it? *By the obedience of faith in* IMMERSION; and here we have the important design of *baptism;* not to change the heart, but to *change the conscience.* The testimony of Peter is sufficient to confirm this assertion. He makes the salvation of Noah in the ark from the deluge, by *believing* what God had told him, and *doing* what he had commanded him, a type or figure of the salvation of those who, by immersion, enter the ark of the New Covenant. "The antitype, *immersion,* does also *now* SAVE *us,* (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh; but the *seeking* [answer or obtaining] of a GOOD CONSCIENCE toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." As many of the opposers of immersion for the remission of sins, harp upon the sentence,—"not the putting away of the filth of the flesh,"—I will offer an explanation. The Jews, part of whose worship under the Mosaic institution, consisted in meats and drinks and divers immersions;—ordinances concerning the *flesh,* imposed till the time of reformation; used water to cleanse and purify the *body.* Peter tells those to whom he was writing, that this was not the design of Christian immersion; but to affect the *conscience.* And how is this to be done? Sin causes or makes a *guilty* conscience, and a *remission of sins* must be the means of obtaining a *good* one. Christian immersion is the medium through which this is to be obtained and enjoyed, since it has been *procured* by the blood of Christ, "without the shedding of which there is no remission," under the New Covenant. A few testimonies will suffice here. Peter, in addressing the Jews on the day of Pentecost, when he had convinced them of sin, and they had evinced their faith by the inquiry which they made, told them, "Reform, and be each of you *immersed* in the name of Jesus Christ, *in order to the remission of sins.*" And when Paul had believed and reformed, we hear Ananias addressing him in similar language—"Arise, and be *immersed and wash away your sins,* invoking the name of the Lord." Plenty of other testimonies might be introduced, which, though not so direct, are equally as strong and conclusive. What I am endeavoring to show, is, that sin is the cause of a guilty conscience—that baptism puts the believer into possession of the remission of sins—that remission of sins changes the conscience—and that, consequently, *believer's baptism produces a change of conscience.*

Faith, repentance, or reformation, and immersion, issue in a *change of* STATE, in which the remission of sins is possessed and enjoyed. The *alien* who had been a subject in the kingdom of nature, into which he had been born by his natural birth, is now made a citizen of the kingdom of favor, into which he is born by a *new* or *spiritual birth.* Paul, in his letter to the Colossians, calls it a *translation.* "Who [the Father] has delivered us from the power of darkness, and has *translated* us into the *kingdom* of his beloved Son; *by whom* we have redemption through his blood, even the *remission of sins.*"—And in addressing the believing Hebrews upon the great privileges which they enjoyed in their new state, he describes them thus:—

Digitized by Google

"Having, therefore, brethren, free access to the most holy place, *by the blood* of Jesus—a new and living way, which he has consecrated for us through the vail, [that is flesh;] and a great High Priest over the house of God; let us draw near, with a *true heart, in full assurance of faith; having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water*, let us hold fast the *confession* of the hope unmoved; for he is faithful who has promised." The figure here used is *metonymy*, in which the cause is put for the effect—the thing itself for that signified by it. They had their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience by faith in the *blood* of Jesus, as the *procuring* cause of that remission which was to give a good conscience, or to *change* the conscience; and which they were to be put into the possession or enjoyment of, by having their bodies washed with *pure* water, or the water of baptism, which, through faith, thus *cleanses, purifies*, and *changes the conscience*. This is beautifully illustrated by a passage from the letter to the Ephesians, in which the cleansed and purified state of the congregation is described. "Christ also loved the congregation, and gave himself for it, that he might *sanctify* it, having *cleansed* it with a BATH OF WATER; that he might present it to himself glorious—a congregation not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it might be holy, and without blemish." The bath of water, Paul, in his letter to Titus, calls the "bath of regeneration," where he beautifully contrasts the two states—the *new* state of the christians with their *alien* or former state. "For even we ourselves *were formerly* foolish, disobedient, erring, slavishly serving divers inordinate desires and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one other. But when the goodness and philanthropy of God our Saviour shone forth, he *saved* us, not on account of works of righteousness which we had done, but according to his own mercy, through the BATH OF REGENERATION, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit; which he poured out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being *justified* by his *favor*, we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." The two states are also contrasted in the first letter to the Corinthians, where the *action* performed in the *bath* is called a washing. "Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor catamites, nor sodomites, nor thieves, nor misers, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such *were* some of you; but you are WASHED, but you are *sanctified*, but you are *justified* by the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." In all these places, as well as in the Acts and all the Epistles, the new state in which christians are placed by change from their old one, is amply illustrated, and contrasted with the latter. All persons who have the change of heart and conscience, for which I am contending, have this change of state; which, I think, has been clearly and amply demonstrated. The medium, too, through which this new state is to be entered, has also been as clearly pointed out—"Unless a man be BORN OF WATER AND SPIRIT, he *cannot* enter the kingdom of God," in which alone he can enjoy this new and changed state.

Digitized by Google

The Christian religion contains a philosophy the most perfect, sublime, and beautiful that man ever knew. The Christian system of government is the only perfect and complete one on earth. All its parts are exactly fitted and suited to each other, and to the end for which they are intended; and all taken together form a harmonious whole, or body of doctrine, without a single jarring or discordant member. Facts precede and constitute testimony—testimony precedes and produces faith; then follows repentance and reformation, change of heart, remission of sins in immersion, change of conscience, change of state, and a life of holiness and heavenly rejoicing.

The Christian revelation is addressed to man as he *is*—not as he *has* been—not as he *shall* be. It is addressed to man as an intellectual and moral being; and it is adapted to the wants of his intellectual and moral condition. It contemplates him as fallen and degenerated from his primeval state—the state in which he was created; but being endowed with capacities and faculties by which he may be prepared to rise, and even to transcend *that* state—to be exalted to celestial felicity, a spiritual existence, freed from all the evils of death, disease, and sin; and be brought back into an intimate and abiding union with his Creator and Preserver; to accomplish which constitutes the grand design of the remedial dispensation. It is addressed to man not only as a being liable to commit sin, but contemplates him as a *sinner*, breathing a tainted moral atmosphere since sin entered into the world. Christianity proposes a remedy adequate to his moral disease in its most aggravated and chronic forms. But this remedy must be applied in the order of Heaven—according to the prescriptions and directions of the great Physician. All the symptoms must be attended to, and the remedies applied in the order laid down or prescribed. Reverse that order, or confound its parts, and death, or an aggravation of the disease, may be the consequence; mingle with these divine prescriptions those of human philosophy, and they become weak and inefficient.

Who would not submit his case to this great and omnipotent Physician, and following the prescriptions as they are in his Book of practice, be healed of his moral diseases, and fitted for an existence so transcendently superior to the present? The unregenerate man would give thousands—yes, millions,—yes, worlds, if he had them, for an *elixir* which would confer upon him an immortal earthly existence, and free him from the fear and power of the "king of terrors." But what is such an existence, full of its toils, its pains, its troubles, trials, and sorrows, compared with a "mansion in the skies," where God "shall wipe away every tear from their eyes;" and death shall be no more, nor grief, nor crying, nor shall there be any more pain?" It was in infinite wisdom and mercy that God, when man had tasted of the fruit of the forbidden tree, debarred him from partaking of that of the tree of life. It would be inconsistent with man's real and permanent good and happiness, to exist forever in his present state. And what is that state compared with the future? What are all the crowns which earthly valor has won, compared with that

Digitized by Google

"crown of life—of righteousness—of rejoicing—of glory incorruptible, and that fades not away"? What are all earthly grandeur, glory, and splendor, compared with that of the righteous, who "shall shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father"? What are all the riches and possessions of the world, compared with that "inheritance, incorruptible, and undefiled, and unfading"? This crown, this glory, and this inheritance, are freely offered to the acceptance of *all*, by the same Spirit who says, "COME, and drink of the water of life FREELY." J. R. H.

Oak Grove, near Paris, Ten. Feb. 20th, 1835.

OFFENCES.

JAMESTOWN, Ohio, March 9, 1835.

Beloved brother Campbell,

THERE prevails a notion among the disciples here, and, I expect, elsewhere also, that when they take offence at one another, upon any trifling cause, they have the right to separate themselves from communion with the church. What I mean by communion with the church, is the eating of the Lord's supper. They suppose that they have the right to absent themselves from the Lord's table, because some brother or sister has done something that has displeased them. This, to me, looks like claiming the privilege to disobey God, because some brother or sister has done something wrong, in the judgment of the absentee. Jesus commanded his disciples to eat the bread, and drink the wine, in memory of him; but some suppose they have the right to dispense with this command, every time they take offence at a brother or sister in the church. And what is still more astonishing, they claim the authority of the scripture for this practice, as though the scripture contradicted itself. Because Paul commanded the church at Corinth to put disorderly persons from among them, and not to eat with any such persons, some have made an individual application of this text, and claim the right to separate themselves when they please, not only from the person whom they suppose to have broken the law of Christ, but from all the other members of the church also.

Now, brother Campbell, all such persons have mistaken the law of Christ, or else I honestly acknowledge that I have mistaken it. I cannot find an *if* to any command in the Book of God. He did not say, 'Do this in remembrance of me, unless some brother or sister should do wrong;' or, 'If all the members of the church do right, *then* do this in remembrance of me."

M. WINANS.

THE subject of the above communication is a grievous evil, and ought to be scripturally and speedily redressed. It proceeds upon mistaken views of our responsibilities respecting the faults of our brethren—as if we were chargeable with, or accountable for, their delinquencies, because we partake with them in the social duties and privileges of our religious profession. This, however, cannot be the case, if we faithfully discharge our relative duties with respect to our offending brethren, according to the scriptures; which, upon this important affair, are as plain and practicable as we could desire. All our duties of this class are reduced to two items, viz—tresspasses and sins. The former, respecting private or personal offences committed against one another, individually considered; the latter, respecting

Digitized by Google

public transgressions of the divine law, committed against the moral government of God. With respect to the former, see Matth. xviii. 15—19.; for the latter, see 1 Tim. v. 20. These two rules of procedure respecting delinquents, duly and faithfully observed, under the influence of the universal maxim, 1 Cor. xvi. 14. "Let all things be done with love," would keep peace and purity in christian societies. Let our brethren, then, be duly warned and admonished to yield a most punctual and conscientious obedience to those divine precepts, as they value their own spiritual comfort, and the honor, peace, and purity of the church of God. When any private personal offence is committed, let the offended proceed without delay according to Matth. xviii. 15—19. And when any public violation of the law of Christ is committed, let the transgressor, without delay, be dealt with according to 1 Tim. v. 20. And let the proceedings, in both cases, be conducted in love, according to 1 Cor. xvi. 14.; and the church will shine in the beauties of holiness. But says one, 'What shall I do with an offending brother, in case of a private personal offence or tresspass, until I can get the matter legally settled?' Why, act according to the dictates of love, which "thinks no evil—hopes all things;" —puts the best construction possible upon every thing—hopes all things for the best; and, proceeding thus, you will find no difficulty in keeping your place with him at the Lord's table, until the event of the pending process determine his character, and then all difficulty will be removed. But, in the mean time, influenced by that love that hopes all things—that thinks no evil, you will make the just and necessary distinction between *weakness* and *wickedness*, and will charitably ascribe the pending offence to the former, till the issue declare otherwise, if such should unhappily be the case; and then, if it should, you will yet rid of the obstinate offender. Another may yet inquire, 'How shall I act in case of an offence, whether of a private or public nature, when it is so circumstanced that the offender has not been, or cannot be, notified or brought to trial?' For instance A sees B act out of character on Saturday; but from the circumstances of the case, has not an opportunity to reprove him. The next day (Sunday) they both meet in the congregation, yet so circumstanced as to prevent a private interview. B takes his place as usual at the Lord's table. What shall A do in the case? Why, in the exercise of that charity "that thinks no evil"—"that hopes all things" favorable, let him, in the mean time, indulge the pleasing hope, that B has repented, confessed, and so has obtained mercy; and let him afterwards take the first favorable opportunity to expostulate with him upon the alleged impropriety of behaviour, both for his brother's benefit and his own exoneration; and then act towards him according to the above cited rules, as the case may require. If, however, the supposed misdemeanor were of such a nature and character, as to inflict public disgrace upon the congregation for having such a delinquent in its fellowship; then, instead of the above course of christian forbearance, A should immediately inform the church, by its proper officers, and thus prevent its future defamation. These things duly attended to, in the

Digitized by Google

benign spirit of true christian sympathy and faithfulness, the scandalous and unhappy evils complained of in the above communication, would be for ever obviated. T. C.

Of the Unity of the Body of Christ,

AND

THE USE AND OPERATION OF FAITH IN ITS PRODUCTION AND PRESERVATION.

THE present chequered and diversied state of *popular christianity*, presents to the philanthropist, who has learned to look at men and things through the divine medium, or the true gospel glass, one of the most melancholy pictures which can well attract his attention. How utterly contrary to the whole tenor of the divine plan! Of all the miserable, worldly, carnal, and grovelling arguments that have been urged in defence of the *assumed, secret, unseen unity*, and yet *real open disunion* of christendom, there has appeared to me but one that can be considered worthy of the least regard; and that is, "that God in the wisdom of his government, has been unwilling, or found it inexpedient to suffer any one among all the hosts of sects to prevail, lest the one so prevailing should turn upon and rend to pieces the rest." All having gone out of the way, I have very little doubt that such would be the result—the rational result of the final ascendency of any one of the popular sects in christendom. God has, therefore, in his mercy weakened the hands of this description of people, lest others of his creatures should be unduly oppressed. This is but a fair and rational conclusion from data, the most self-evident, presented within the last five years by the Regular Baptists, the most liberal, as to personal rights and liberty, of all the sects among us. But, being in possession of their natural faculties, is it not astonishing, that the most superficial in judgment can be one moment at a loss in deciding upon the claims to truth, asserted by the numerous sects of the day? God's word surely must be as plain to comprehension as are the words of their exhibitions. All men may read both, if either, and accordingly judge. While God says, "There is one body, and one spirit; also you have been called with one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, (or gospel) one immersion, one God and Father of all; who is over all, and with all, and in you all:" I say, while God, the sovereign of all, has thus said and written, the *contrary*, in almost every point, is emphatically exhibited by actual practice throughout christendom! If mankind cannot be roused to consideration, how awful must be their fate—*professors and non-professors?* A man who takes shelter under any of the devices of his fellow-man, no matter with what solemnities it may be hallowed and decorated, it will avail him no more than to be found among the *philosophers* of old, or in any of the modern fashionable institutions. It seems to me, that unless christendom, in the most rigid application of the terms, can be *converted to christianity*, the impending vengeance, which awaits the

Digitized by Google

rebellious and stiff-necked, must be poured upon it. The *world* can never be converted until christendom shall cease to mislead it, to confound, and to disgust it. I see as yet no move among all their hosts to come into compliance with the emphatic petition of their professed leader; who, in his pathetic, but yet unavailing appeal in their behalf,* said, "Nor do I pray for these alone, but for those also who shall believe on me me through their teaching, that they all may be *one*; that as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, they also may be one in us, *that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*" What use can the sectarian world make of this petition? If they pray for any thing themselves, are they not bound by all consistency to strive in accordance with the petition. Have we not both the prayer and the command of Jesus to contend for unity? But what are we doing? Brethren, our only apology must be, that we have scales upon our eyes—all christendom and the world are yet in darkness. Let us put forth our pens and our voice to enlighten the blind—arouse the deaf, by an untiring, unfearing proclamation of truth. Let us gently insist on the establishment of the way of the Lord upon the ruins of all human devices. The surest way to elicit truth, pure truth, is to insist that all are wrong but ourselves, upon the simple principle, that though *all may be wrong, one only can be right*, in case of disagreement.

I will now submit to the reader a proposition which bears immediately upon the present distracted state of christendom. I trust, that while it shall be found of service to those who are laboring for the restoration of a pure speech in religion, it will not be utterly unavailing to those of another description, should it fall under their notice. It is this: If A believes upon the testimony of C, in the existence of a *certain fact*—in other words, if *the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth* has been told by C concerning a *certain fact*, and *accordingly believed* by A, it is utterly impossible that B, or any other person, *can believe contrary to*, or *different from* A, as to this fact. And why not?—Because the *testimony* in the supposed case is a true exhibition of the fact, and, of course stands to it in the relation of cause and effect;—while the *faith* is, in like manner, predicated alone upon the truth as exhibited in the *testimony*, and can only be so. If, then, the testimony, as a cause, produces its proper, legitimate, and full effect at all, it must and will be always, without exception, *faith or belief*, and nothing else. If testimony fails to produce faith (which will be identically the same exercise, though it occupy ten thousand hearts at the same moment, in different measures in each) it may yet produce another and inferior effect—a mere *opinion*. It also frequently fails to produce any positive effect, leaving the subject in entire *unbelief*, or in an unconverted state. A gun, well charged, will cause its shot to penetrate effectually one board, make indentations in another, while upon other bodies no impression may be made. There

* Except in the light of *believers in Jesus only*, and not of *christians*, strictly speaking, who both believe in, and *obey Jesus*, I am inclined to think that this petition cannot be applicable to the present state of christendom. For the present, however, it is admitted upon this ground.

Digitized by Google

are many things in scripture, upon which we are allowed to enjoy and indulge *opinions;* some in which *knowledge* or experience is involved and permitted; but in the great matter of reconciliation and obedience, as included in the pretensions of Jesus of Nazareth, his death, burial, resurrection, ascension, forgiveness of sins, the unity of of the body of Christ, of attention to commandments and ordinances, we have things plainly written and submitted to us, in order to faith and obedience.

If the premises above laid down be true, then it is no longer difficult to solve the extravagant paradox, which professing christendom presents, to wit:—that the church militant is but one, though it be divided into many discordant parts; inasmuch as that all these numerous heterogeneous, discordant, ill-willed, contentious, opposing, slanderous, persecuting, and oppressive members of each other, uniformly agree in the great vitals of religion, while they fall out only on account of non-essentials. And thus we are made to witness how much more striking, efficient, and wide spread effects are produced by disagreement about *non-essentials*, than are produced by their laudable, holy, harmonious, and scriptural union and agreement in the great vital essentials of christianity. What an imposition is here practised upon the credulity of mankind! Is it not astonishing that mankind do not arise in the strength and majesty of reason, with which the Creator has richly endowed and elevated them, shake off the scales and shackles of superstition, delusion, and deception, and assert their rights!

Now the true secret of this mystery of confusion, rebellion against God, reason, and mankind, is, that while the great mass of these professors do, in all probability, really believe in a greater or lesser number of insulated facts, according to the divine testimony, they do not know or observe the true difference between *opinions* and *faith*, often thinking that they *believe* things, as to which they really have only *opinions;* thus in fact failing to believe, they *disbelieve* the word of God; and accordingly, predicating their actions or course of obedience and worship upon the precarious and multifarious foundations of human conjecture and invention, instead of upon the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief foundation corner stone. Instead of rearing our building according to the one faith, the one Lord, one God, one Spirit, one immersion, with one order and worship—we present buildings many, faiths many, Lords many, Gods many, Spirits many, baptisms many, orders and worships many. And all this is for the want of *faith*, that thing of which the people hear so much and enjoy so little. It is the substitution of *opinions* for *faith*, and thus exhibiting them under a false name, that has deluged the world with such sad confusion and darkness. As before stated, no two can believe differently upon the same testimony. Let me be understood if possible. It seems to me to be a truth of great importance. I will, therefore, say again, in other words, if James believes upon the testimony of Richard, that Peter is an African, it is impossible for another to believe him, upon the

Digitized by Google

same testimony, to be otherwise. Any *opinion, doubt*, or *unbelief* as to this fact, which may be entertained, can never be traced to the testimony, but must arise from another source. There is nothing more easy than for a man to practise this delusion upon his own mind, by substituting the belief of his own *inference* from any given doctrine, and think that he really *believes* the doctrine itself, instead of his own inference or opinion. For instance: Peter said on the day of Pentecost, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." I will here demonstrate the truth of the position for which I am contending, with the help of a Regular Baptist, in form of a dialogue:—

Disciple. You profess to be a christian. Do you believe the words that I have just quoted from the 2d of Acts?

Regular Baptist. I do; and not only so, but the word of God in general.

D. I am glad to hear it; we believe alike, and like those, too, who believed Peter—a matter this of great importance. But I have been uncharitable enough to *believe* that you did not hitherto *believe* those notable words of Peter. I owe you an apology.

R. B. I surely do believe, as I am in duty bound to do, the words of Peter.

D. I wish you to be clear and explicit upon this matter. On the memorable day, and upon the memorable faith and obedience of the crucifiers of Jesus, was set up and founded the first christian congregation, which subsequently became the model of all others. We are aiming at their primitive course. You believe, you say, that baptism was to those penitents to be administered for the "remission of sins."

R. B. By no means. I believe no such thing.

D. Then you do not believe Peter, but must disbelieve him.

R. B. God forbid! But I *believe* that the three thousand, having had their sins pardoned, they were now to be baptized in reference to that remission.

D. Where do you find the testimony upon which these items of faith are predicated? Surely not among the words of Peter!

R. B. I do not; but it is a fair *inference* from the premises; for I could never believe that baptism will afford forgiveness of sins—no, never. No mere "bodily act" can be so estimated by me.

D. Nor do I believe that baptism out of its connexion, and without divine appointment, would avail. But I perceive that you do not believe Peter as to this particular at all. You have called up before the court of your understanding another witness, who is made to testify, in addition to Peter, what Peter means by his testimony. You believe the testimony of your *inference*, which is contrary to the words of Peter, rather than the plain, reasonable words of Peter himself; and so you utterly disbelieve the divine word.

R. B. Impossible! In all difficult, obscure, figurative, or allusive portions of scripture, we are authorized to resort to inference, and so make up and enjoy our own opinions.

Digitized by Google

D. Granted; but when we can possibly understand the language of scripture literally, we must do so—when the language will only admit of inference, it may be justly indulged. But the passage before us is quite plain.

R. B. I cannot think so, unless it be taken in the sense in which you contend for it, which I can never believe.

D. The contrary you cannot believe according to the words; but if you will listen to a partial witness, as is your *inference* in the present case, like the crucifiers of Jesus, you will be at no loss for testimony against Jesus and his holy religion. But be honest; does he not mean literally what he says, when he commands the Jews to repent?

R. B. Certainly; but repentance is a very different matter from baptism. It takes hold of the heart.

D. Hence, these are so beautifully associated with each other, and with faith, in the divine plan. Faith enters with all her luminous power and influence, emanating from the divine words of the Apostles, as the rays of the sun drive away the darkness and gloom of night, enabling her recipients to contemplate fully the philanthropy of God our heavenly Father, in the gift of his Son; they fall in *love with him*, without which we cannot serve him; they repent of their sins; and having thus yielded in *spirit* and *soul* to him, all that remains is to seal our final surrender by submitting our body to be buried in the hope of a glorious resurrection to eternal life, thereby realizing the promises of forgiveness, of the Holy Spirit, and life eternal. I pray you to study the subject before us carefully. You will be able in due time to ascertain whether you believe the Apostles or your own inferences.

The foregoing reflections upon one of the principal causes of the present apostacy, from the beginning to the present period, are respectfully submitted to the serious consideration of the reader—by

JOHN.

Education---No. 5.

NATURE bestows the model of all our conceptions of order, symmetry, beauty, and perfection. Our best ideas of method, arrangement, and contrivance, are but the image of the archetypes which she exhibits. Our most splendid attainments in the useful and fine arts, are our most successful imitations of the touches of her hand. We never can advance one step before her; we are wise and fortunate when we cautiously and attentively follow in the path she leads.

As a school mistress we must give her the award of unrivalled excellency, and regard her as the only perfect standard, worthy of our most unreserved and implicit respect and imitation. Soon as the new born infant enters her school, and has been taught to fix his attention upon her instructions, she proceeds to expand and develope all his physical powers by exercise. Her first care is to enlarge and

Digitized by Google

strengthen the organs and instruments by which the mind is to act, and be acted upon. These she calls forth into exercise by the impulse of all the animal appetites, and by the stimulus of the sensible properties of all surrounding objects. She combines the fostering care of the mother with the didactic habits of the mistress, and equally and constantly cultivates alike the body, the soul, and the spirit of all her pupils. Let us, then, go and do likewise.

Mothers are of necessity and of right the first teachers. How important, then, that they themselves have been well educated. On them physically, intellectually, morally, chiefly depend the destinies of the whole race. On this account females deserve, demand, and are worthy to receive as good an education as the males—as good, indeed, as can be bestowed in twenty years; for no English or American lady should be considered marriageable, or worthy of a diploma, till she have at least completed her twentieth year. We care not who asserts the contrary; for it is most unphilosophic, and rather misanthropic than philanthropic, to bestow more pains or expense in training a son than a daughter, unless in reference to some special calling which falls not at all within the sphere of female employment. As far as the full development and cultivation of all their physical, intellectual, and moral powers and capacities are concerned, their chances should be perfectly equal; or, if any preference, it should be in favor of the weaker sex, who need it most and have most to do with it. As we love our species then, and as we would ameliorate and improve society, let the females of our country have an equal chance of education in the true and full import of that word; then we may expect them to be the *magnæ matres virorum*—the worthy mothers of *men*. To return from this apostrophe:—

Mothers must be the first pedagogues. They must be; for God has so decreed: and they certainly are, or may be the best. And can there be to them a more "delightful task" than to "rear the tender thought," of their own dear offspring—"to teach the young idea how to shoot?" But there is one lesson, which, above all others, they will, or ought to have learned: for Nature teaches it more frequently and more emphatically than any other;—need I say that it is this—that the physical education of the child is their first and most imperious duty. By *the physical education* of children we mean every thing that tends to the full growth and development of all the members, organs, and parts of the animal frame. This is a subject daily and hourly exciting and interesting the more thoughtful and intelligent portion of the community; but the great mass have not yet begun to think about it; and of those who have begun to speculate on the subject, but few have begun to practise conformably to the theory. We would not, indeed, endorse for all the speculations of Gall, Spurzheim, and Combe, on the new science of Phrenology; but certainly there is as much fact and rational induction embraced in their reasonings, not only upon the brain as the organ of thought, the instrument by, and upon which, the mind acts, and is acted upon; but upon the whole physical constitution of man; as to demonstrate, be-

Digitized by Google

yond rational doubt, that much, very much depends upon the proper exercise, direction, and employment of infancy and childhood, of every animal organ for the future intellectual and moral character of the adult man.

These developments, how fondly soever sceptics have feasted upon them as favorable to the omnipotence of their tissues of circumstances, only unfold the wisdom of the Jewish and Christian prophets and instructers of mankind, by showing that Moses and Solomon spake with a wisdom beyond their own times, when the former made the education of children the first concern of every family and state, and the infallible means of forming character; and the latter, in reference to "the mind illumined face," not only asserted that wisdom shone in the face, but commanded, as an infallible law, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it."

But, indeed, the ancients followed nature incomparably more exactly than the moderns, and needed not the developments of physiology to regulate their practice. They had no idea of immuring babes in infant schools, nor of sending infants to those juvenile penitentiaries called grammar schools. We have erred so far from nature, from reason, and religion, that it will be well for society in this age of degeneracy, if the facts and inductions of philosophy and phrenology should be able to check the aberrations of society from nature and religion, and to teach what the ancients knew without learning, that a sound and mature mind requires a sound and mature body; and that the first duty of parents and teachers is to take care of the body, and spare no pains in developing and corroborating by suitable training and agreeable exercise, all the physical powers as the basement story of the intellectual and moral man.

This is a system of tuition, for which a village or country schoolmaster, with his primer, birch or hickory ferula, is as perfectly unqualified as an Egyptian Sultan to be a Christian missionary. The woods, lawns, green fields, gardens, shrubberies, are the proper primers; and maternal or paternal smiles, or frowns, the motives to diligence and industry in the amusing and improving studies of nature.

It is not our province, and we cannot task ourselves with the duty, to instruct parents how much the skin, head, heart, lungs, stomach, liver, arms and legs of their children demand their unremitting attention. If these, however, are neglected, I need not tell them that the intellectual and moral stories of the human edifice cannot be reared to their proper dimensions.

Mother Nature says, Exercise gently, gradually, constantly, without oppression, without fatigue, without excess, every organ, faculty, power, and capacity, whether physical, mental, or moral, on agreeable and appropriate objects, in the exact ratio of the years and strength of the infant man; not neglecting one and bestowing extraordinary care and attention on another. But as God has made body, soul, and spirit, do you train them all; find proper aliment, exercise, and pleasure for all. Tithe not the mind at the expense of the body—nor task the body at the cost of the mind. Remember there are five

Digitized by Google

senses in the outward man, and that these are all to be employed healthily and agreeably on material nature; inasmuch as she makes these her only avenues to the inward man, and prepares all her qualities, attributes, and powers, to give knowledge, pleasure, or pain to the mind by sensation, or through the ingenious and pleasurable machinery of our senses. In one word—Parents, consider your children as the gifts of God, and regard all the faculties and powers he has bestowed on them as all worthy of your care, attention, aad training; and by no means suffer any of them to languish through neglect; but so cultivate and direct all in rational and religious reference to the high and holy destiny vouchsafed to man by his wise and bountiful Creator.

Exercise, it must be conceded, enlarges and improves every member and organ of the body. The enlarged muscle of the blacksmith's arm and of the pedestrian's leg arrest the attention of all. Those who learn any trade or calling, which more particularly employs some members of the body, or which more intensely engages some of the vital organs or senses, always possess those parts or organs in higher perfection than other men, and even than their other organs and faculties. Dr. Rush somewhere asserts that he never knew a a public crier, an auctioneer, or a preacher* die of pulmonary consumption. Indeed, all men of observation and science concur in this proposition—that proper exercise, not carried to excess, enlarges and strengthens every organ and every faculty of man.

It is even true of vegetables as of animals. Those who grow in the shade, how pale and feeble compared with those that endure the buffetings of the storm and the beatings of the rain. See yonder aged oak of prodigious trunk, and thick wide-spreading branches, that now rears its leafless form from that craggy summit, and which seems to break the lowering clouds that pass through its aged limbs. Why stands it alone triumphant over all the storms of centuries, while those in the thick forests and in the plains have been so often prostrated to the ground, and now give their rotten remains to enrich the soil on which they once luxuriant grew! The cause is this—that king of all the neighboring forest was always exposed to the peltings of the storm. Exercised and shaken by all the rains and winds of heaven, it sent its roots deeper into the earth and stretched forth its arms upwards to the skies. Thus it acquired a strength and stateliness of form unknown to those in the rich vallies; and depending only on its resources, it took a firmer hold of the soil, and now stands an instructive monument to man of the advantages of being placed in favorable circumstances to the full development and exercise of all his powers, terrestrial and celestial. Remember, curious reader, that this venerable oak, of such majestic mien and strength, was once a tender sappling, shaken by every wind and tempest, tossed for many years; but from this discipline of heaven, it has acquired a majesty which far overtops all its species, and which now

* We have known some, who, by unmerciful vociferation, so inflated their lungs as to rupture blood vessels, and thus superinduce phthisis pulmonaris.

Digitized by Google

makes it a parable to instruct the aged, and to admonish the young who desire the loftiest eminence of usefulness and happiness.

EDITOR.

To Dr. James H. Otey, Bishop of Tennessee.

Letter I.

Mr dear Sir,

COULD I, with all due consideration to my Lord the King, address any Episcopal gentleman in the wide circle of my personal acquaintance, with the title of *Right Reverend*, the respect and esteem in which you are held by me, would have induced me now to approach you in the usual style of reverential homage. But, sir, with me words are signs of ideas; and, unless I speak ironically, there is but one being in this universe whom I can conscientiously and sincerely address under that title—"Holy and *Reverend* is his name."

Your high official station as *Bishop of the whole state of Tennessee*, my good sir, had it been conferred on you directly by Jesus Christ himself, would have commanded my most respectful submission—not more, however, than your great personal worth constrains my admiration and respect. The excellent character which your neighbors have awarded you, was fully confirmed to me by the very favorable opinion which my late visit to Franklin enabled me to form of you; and the many agreeable incidents of the long and pleasant evening which I had the honor to spend with you on the 18th inst. at your hospitable mansion, have deeply impressed upon my mind an obligation, which I now in part attempt to discharge.

The first topic which engaged our attention, and which you were pleased to introduce, very naturally grew out of the discourse which you heard me deliver on the forenoon of that day, on the *high priesthood* of Jesus the Messiah, and the priestly relation in which *all christians* sustain to God through him. True, indeed, the views which I then offered gave to all christians an *anointing* which fully authorized them to offer all their own gifts, sacrifices, and offerings, most acceptably to God, through one great High Priest in heaven, without the mediation, interposition, or intercession of any consecrated priest on earth. This view of the "elect race," of the "holy priesthood," of the "spiritual temple," of the whole christian community, did, indeed, divest any order of officers in the church of any priestly character as peculiarly or exclusively theirs: and while we carefully impressed upon our audience the necessity of order and office in every christian church, we were only emphatic on this point:—*that all church officers are no more priests in relation to God, than the brethren over whom they preside, and whom they serve in the institutions of our High Priest in heaven.* Hence the prayers, thanksgivings, and spiritual sacrifices of sister Phebe, are as acceptable to God as those of

Digitized by Google

"His Grace" the Archbishop of Canterbury could be in any circumstance whatever. This sentiment did at once nullify all the sacerdotal pretensions of all the Catholic and Protestant priests; and I was peculiarly pleased to hear you read, from high episcopal authority, from the standards of your own church, an unequivocal disavowal of the papistical notions concerning the officers and offices of the christian church, and a full confirmation of the views which I had the honor to express in your hearing on that occasion.

This happy coincidence between my sermon and your ecclesiastic authorities, naturally introduced the question, "*What, then, serveth the christian ministry?*" We had both divested them of any sacerdotal attribute or function more than their brethren, and consequently left them no claim whatever to the appropriation of the title *priest*. It appeared on all the premises that the Roman clergy have as much reason to claim, and as much right to wear exclusively, the designation *christian* as that of *priest*.

The question, *What serves the christian ministry?* was answered first negatively, without controversy and without discussion. It was agreed that it pertains not at all to priestly things or functions. That there is a christian ministry in the christian church, or that there are officers in every organized christian community essential to its perfection, was also without discussion or debate, most promptly and cordially conceded by us both. Happy to agree so far, it was with fear and trembling I saw you casting an eye askance towards the question of *succession* in the christian ministry. Though I expected as much candor and as much manly sense and independence of mind from Bishop Otey as from any episcopal dignitary on earth, still I could not but regard myself, in attempting a discussion of the question of episcopal succession with you, the dioscean prelate of the state, in the same light as I would contemplate a republican debating with the reigning king of France on the divine right of kings.—Nothing could have emboldened me, on my own responsibility, to have introduced such a topic at such a time. But, sir, the good natured, frank, and candid manner in which you introduced that subject, and the most perfect familiarity which characterized our whole interview on all topics, authorized me to answer all your questions, without the fear of marring in the least the good and friendly feelings displayed and reciprocated in all our communications.

Not at all attempting to go into any of the details of that happy evening, either on this subject, or on any of the various and numerous points on which we communed, and on most of which we so happily agreed, I only design to discharge an obligation arising from the favor you conferred on me, by presenting me at the close of the evening with a copy of "*Episcopacy tested by Scripture—by the Right Reverend* Henry U. Onderdonk, *D. D. Assistant Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. New York. Printed* 1833." It afforded me much pleasure to see that Bishop Onderdonk had inscribed upon the title-page of his well-written tract, the motto, "*To the law and to the testimony.*" This disposed me to

Digitized by Google

give his pamphlet a very candid and impartial hearing. "To the law and to the testimony" I always make my appeal. Finding this learned Bishop agreeing with me in the premises, in the court to which the parties should appeal, and the judges before whom the cause should be tried, I determined to accompany him; and should judgment be given in his favor, I was prepared in mind for all the consequences. But when the Bishop opened his cause in that court, it appeared that he had mistaken the question, and in consequence of some serious informalities, involving the very points at issue, a decision in his favor could not be obtained.

Determined, however, to ascertain whether the fault was in the Bishop, or his cause, I obtained an "Essay on the Invalidity of Presbyterian Ordination, by *John Esten Cooke*, M. D. of Lexington, Ky. 1829." Dr. Chapman I have had in my library for some years. These gentlemen, like all their predecessors, wholly mistake the question, and imagine the impotency of their opponents an irrefragable proof of the justice of their plea and the authority of their conclusions. I am not, therefore, without hope, especially when I consider the intelligence and liberality of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the impotency of some who have opposed them, both Catholic, Presbyterian, and Methodist, that you and many others may yet vote for a reconsideration of the matter *ab initio*, and hear the cause of christian episcopacy as pleaded by those, who say and believe with the renowned Chillingworth, that "the Bible, the BIBLE ALONE is the religion of Protestants."

I confess I shall be disappointed if you, or any of the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States, depart, in this case, from the wonted magnanimity and liberality, which, for centuries, and especially in these United States, *since the Revolution*, have adorned your community. While, then, I humbly attempt to show, that in your arguments and reasonings there yet remaineth error; or, to speak still more modestly, there lacketh proof of your system of ecclesiastical government, I request a candid hearing, and an impartial, (if that word imply not what is unreasonable)—I say, an *impartial* examination.

There is no debate between you and me—none between Bishop Onderdonk and Presbyterians, or between Dr. Cook and his Methodist brethren, about *episcopacy*, absolutely so called. We all agree that the christian communities are of necessity, and by divine authority, under an *episcopacy*—an oversight; and that every well organized christian community ought to have its overseers, presidents, or bishops. We also all agree that the terms *bishop* and *elder* in the New Institution are perfectly equipollent—used as equivalent and convertible terms; that there ought to be *deacons*, or public servants of the congregations; and there is not between us any serious difficulty about the ordination of these officers, by prayer, fasting, and the imposition of hands. But you all—I mean, you of the Catholic, Protestant, Presbyterian, and Methodist communions, agree in one point, for which, we, who take the Bible alone—we, who date the

Digitized by Google

the Christian Institution from the *fiftieth* day after the resurrection of the Messiah, from the first Pentecost after the Crucifixion—we, who begin at Jerusalem, and not at Rome—demand proof. And, strange to tell, this is the very point which Bishop Onderdonk assumes. He says, his "main question is concerning the superiority of Bishops."* "If," adds he, "we can establish the rights of our highest grade of the ministry, there can be little dispute concerning the degrees of sacred authority assigned by us to the middle and lower grades."† "The main issue, then is, whether presbyters, (or, more strictly, presbyters *alone*,) have a scriptural right to ordain, or whether the agency of a minister of a higher grade than presbyters, is not essential to the due performance of that act. Whatever way this great issue be decided, all subordinate questions go with it—if not necessarily, yet because they will no longer be worth contending for by either party."‡

Now I would most respectfully state, that if such be the main issue, it is the rival pretensions of Catholics, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, &c. that have made it the main issue. And, therefore, it is an issue which owes all its importance to the circumstances of these parties. They all *assume* that there is an *hereditary official grace* which is essentially indestructible. Not even the most flagitious acts of impiety and immorality of the man can interrupt or nullify the virtue of the office. It is assumed that there is a distinct order of men, called of God, as Aaron was, having not only *l'esprit du corps*, but a divinely authorized *succession*, self-creative and self-consecrative, continuing through all time, with the freshness of immortal youth; possessing the sole authority of reading the Scriptures in public assemblies, preaching the gospel, dispensing the ordinances of christianity, and governing the church. But still to simplify the point on which the controversy rests—the main issue which the Christians and the Pope have made, and which I, my dear sir, must join with all the advocates of diocesan episcopacy, is found in the assumption of Bishop Onderdonk. I need not say, that the idea or thing called *succession in office*, by authority of Jesus Christ as essential to the administration of the institution called the kingdom or church in this world, is that assumption which has escaped the worthy "Assistant Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania." This succession not being proved by any of your writers which have fallen into my hands, they all beginning at the second, and not at the basement story of the house of Aaron, their superstructure is to my mind as truly baseless as the earth resting upon the back of a tortoise, which itself stands upon nothing.

If there had been only one precept delivered to the churches by any apostle, or any saying of theirs implying the duty of christians to preserve such succession—or to the Bishops of Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, Corinth, or Philippi, either concerning their own succession

---

* *Page* 11. † *Page* 11. ‡ *Page* 12.

Digitized by Google

or the necessity of transmitting from generation to generation certain hereditary rights of office, reason would command that I should diligently consider it. But in the perfect absence of any such intimation, and in view of the fact that Paul makes succession in office an argument to show the *imperfection* of the antecedent economy, judge my surprise at seeing not merely succession in office pleaded as essential to the perfection of the christian economy, but also assumed as a part of the christian institution itself!

I will not now institute an inquiry whether the authority to ordain to office, or to administer ordinances, can be more honorably or safely lodged in the person of Pope Gregory and his heirs forever, or in the words of the Apostle; or whether the grace of office is more direct and accessible, flowing from the head of the church, by the constitutional provisions found in the volume of the Good Spirit: or in the circuitous route of all the crazy and leaky Bishops of seventeen hundred years. This may be a subject of future inquiry; as also the question whether, if succession in office were a part of the Christian Institution, such an unbroken series could be found as would assure us that any man living has the grace of official power which once dwelt in Peter. For, from the Bishop's chain,

"Whatever link you strike,
Tenth, or ten-thousandth, breaks the chain alike."

I will in my next go more into the details of the tract before me.

With every sentiment of esteem and benevolence, I have the honor to be your obedient servant,

A. CAMPBELL.

Cumberland River, March 31, 1835.

Sherlock on Baptism.

WE some months since, at the request of our friend Mr. *J. A. Waterman*, presented to our readers some extracts from Sherlock's work on Providence. Brother *Goodman*, of Rutherford county, Ten. furnished us the other day with a practical discourse on death, from the same eminent writer. He had marked some parts of it as giving the same views of faith, repentance, and baptism, as have been most contumeliously called "*Campbellism*." I will extract a few passages for the purpose of showing how persons of independent mind and deep research may arrive at the same conclusions, in despite of the circumstances that surround them. Need I add, that the Church of England has not in her "Book of Life" a name more generally associated with sound sense, sound learning, and sound piety, than the author of the treatise from which we extract as follows:— *Ed. M. H.*

Ohio River, near Shawneetown, April 1, 1835.

By baptismal repentance, I mean that repentance which is necessary in adult persons, in order to their receiving Christian baptism. This is the repentance which is most frequently mentioned in the

Digitized by Google

New Testament, and to which the promise of remission and forgiveness is annexed. This our Saviour preached: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Matth. iv. 17. This he gave authority to his Apostles to preach, "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations." Luke xix. 47. Now this repentance, both as to Jews and heathens, who embraced the faith of Christ, was renouncing all their former sins, and false superstitions or idolatrous worship; and this qualified them for baptism, in which they obtained the remission of all their sins in the name of Christ. And for this reason the remission of sins is promised to repentance; because all such penitents are received to baptism, which is the washing of regeneration, which washes away all their sins, and puts them in a state of grace and favor with God; as St. Peter tells the Jews, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Acts ii. 38. And much to the same purpose Ananias told St. Paul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts xx. 16. And I know not any one text in the New Testament, wherein the remission of sin is absolutely promised to repentance, but what must be understood of this baptismal repentance: and then repentance and remission of sin are inseparably annexed; because such penitents wash away all their sins in baptism, and come pure and undefiled out of that mystical fountain which is set open for sin and for uncleanness, to wash in and to be clean.

Now I grant, should any person who comes to baptism, rightly qualified and disposed, with a sincere repentance and steadfast faith in Christ, die soon after he is baptized, before he has time and opportunity to exercise any of the graces of the Christian life, such a man shall go to heaven without actual holiness: the remission of his sins in baptism, upon his repentance, will save him, though he have not time to bring forth the fruits of repentance in a holy life. And this is the only case I know of, wherein a penitent can be saved without actual holiness—viz. at baptism, by grace and regeneration.

But you'll say, Is there no place, then, for repentance under the gospel? No remission of sins committed after baptism? God forbid! for who, then, could be saved? Our Saviour taught us to pray every day, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us." (Matthew vi. 12.) and has taught us to forgive our brother though he offended against us seventy times seven, in imitation of God's goodness in forgiving us: and if we must forgive so often, surely God will forgive more than once.

But, then, repentance after baptism requires not only a sorrow for sin, and some good purposes and resolutions of a new life for the future, but the actual forsaking of sin, and amendment of our lives. In baptism, "God justifies the ungodly," Rom. iv. 5.; that is, how wicked soever men have been, whenever they repent of their sins, renounce their former wicked practices, and believe in Christ, and enter into covenant with him by baptism, all their former sins are immediately forgiven and washed away, without expecting the actual refor-

Digitized by Google

mation of their lives. This was plainly the case both with Jewish and Pagan converts, who, upon the profession of their faith in Christ, and renouncing their former wicked lives, whatever they had been, were immediately received to baptism, as St. Peter exhorted the Jews, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," Acts ii. 38.; and the same day there were three thousand baptized. This is gospel grace, which is the purchase of Christ's blood, that the greatest sinners, upon their repentance and faith in Christ, are received to mercy, and wash away all their sins in baptism; but when they are in covenant they shall then be judged according to the terms and condition of that covenant, which requires the practice of an universal righteousness. Such persons must not expect, as St. Paul reasons, that if they continue still in sin grace will abound. The very covenant of grace which we enter into at baptism, confutes all such ungodly hopes; "for how shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know you not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into his death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life." Rom. vi. 1, 2, 3, 4. This is the difference St. Paul makes between the grace of the gospel in receiving the greatest sinners to baptism, and justifying them by the blood of Christ, and what the gospel requires of baptized christians to continue in this justified state. In the first case nothing is required but faith and repentance, upon which account we are so frequently said to be justified by faith, not by the deeds of the law, to be justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, to be saved by grace through faith; not of works, lest any man should boast." And I believe, upon inquiry, it will be found, that justification by faith always relates to this baptismal justification, when by baptism we are received into covenant with God, and into a justified state, only for the sake of Christ, and through faith in his blood; which one thing, well considered, would put an end to most of the disputes about justification, and about faith and works, which I cannot explain now; but shall only observe that the constant opposition between justification by faith in Christ, and justification by circumcision and the works of the law, to the obedience of which they were obliged by circumcision, is a manifest proof that justification by faith is our justification by the faith of Christ in baptism, which is our admission into the christian church, makes us members of Christ and the children of God, which is a state of grace and justification; as circumcision formerly made them God's peculiar people in covenant with him, which is the justification of circumcision; Gal. v. 2, 3. And justification by faith, and justification by circumcision, would not be duly opposed, if they did not relate to the same kind of justification—that is, that justification which is the immediate effect of our being in covenant with God.

But now, when we are justified by general repentance and faith in

Digitized by Google

Christ at baptism, we also vow a conformity to the death of Christ, "by dying to sin, and walking in newness of life;" that is, we now vow a universal obedience to all the laws of righteousness which the gospel requires of us, as circumcision made them debtors to the whole law, which is the reason why the works of the law and the evangelical righteousness which the faith of Christ requires of us, are so often opposed in this dispute; the one, the righteousness of the law, or of works—the other, the righteousness of faith; and therefore, as circumcision could not justify those who transgressed the law, no more will faith justify those who disobey the gospel: "But the righteousness of the law must be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. ii. 13, 25, 27, 28, 29. Rom. viii. 4.

Now the necessary consequence of this is, that mere sorrow for sin, and the mere vows and resolutions of obedience, without actual holiness and obedience of life according to the terms and conditions of the gospel, will not save a baptized christian; for mere sorrow for sin and vows of obedience will be accepted only in baptism; but when we are baptized we must put our vows in execution, or we shall fall from our baptismal grace and justification; and therefore, when we relapse into sin after baptism, no repentance will be accepted but that which actually reforms our lives; for baptismal grace is not ordinarily repeated, no more than we can repeat our baptism.

Evils and Remedy of Sectarianism.

NOTHING better proves the divinity of religion, than the connexion, the harmony, the agreement of its component parts. I am aware that this grand characteristic of christianity has occasioned many mistakes among mankind. Under pretence that a religion proceeding from God must harmonize in its component parts, men have licentiously contrived a chain of propositions to please themselves. They have substituted a phantom of their own imagination, for that body of doctrine which God has given us in the Holy Scriptures. Hence so much obstinacy in maintaining, after so much rashness and presumption in advancing, such phantoms. For, my brethren, of all obstinate people, none excel more in their dreadful kind, than those who are prejudiced in favor of certain systems. A man who does not think himself capable of forming a connected system, can bear contradiction—because, if he be obliged to give up some of the propositions which he has advanced, some others which he embraces will not be disputed, and what remains may indemnify him for what he surrenders. But a man prepossessed with an imaginary system of his own, has seldom so much teachableness. He knows, that if one link be taken away, his chain falls to pieces, and that there is no removing a single stone from his building without destroying the whole edifice. * * * * Let us proceed to inquire why so many of us confine ourselves to a small number of religious truths, and incapacitate ourselves for examining the whole system. * * *

Digitized by Google

The first cause that we have assigned is a *party spirit.* This is a disposition that cannot be easily defined, and it would be difficult to include in a definition of it even its genus and species, it is a monstrous composition of all bad genuses and of all bad species; it is a hydra that reproduces while it seems to destroy itself, and which, when one head has been cut off, instantly produces a thousand more. Sometimes it is superstition, which inclines us to deify certain idols, and, after having formed, to prostrate first before them. Sometimes it is ignorance, which prevents our perceiving the importance of some revealed truths, or the dreadful consequences that we had embraced in childhood. Sometimes it is arrogance, which rashly maintains whatever it has once advanced, advanced perhaps inconsiderately, but which will afterwards be resolutely defended till death, for no other reason but because it has been once asserted, and because it is too mortifying to yield, and say, *I am wrong, I was mistaken.* Sometimes it is a spirit of malice and barbarity, which abhors, exclaims against, persecutes, and would even exterminate all who dare contradict its oracular propositions. Oftener still it is the union of these vices together. A party spirit is that disposition which envenoms so many hearts, separates so many families, divides so many societies, which has produced so many excommunications, thundered out so many anathemas, drawn up so many canons, assembled so many councils, and has been so often on the point of subverting the great work of the reformation, the noblest opposition that was ever formed against it.

This spirit, which we have faintly described, must naturally incapacitate a man for considering the whole of religion: it must naturally incline him to take it only by bits and shreds. On the other hand it contracts the mind: for how can a soul that harbors and cherishes all the phantoms which a party spirit produces, how can such a soul study and meditate as religion requires? On the other hand, a party spirit depraves the heart, and eradicates the desire of knowing religion. A man animated with the spirit of party, directs all his attention to such propositions of religion as seem to favor his erroneous opinions, and irregular passions, and diverts it from all that oppose them; his system includes only what strengthens his party; it is exclusive of every thing that weakens or opposes it.

This is the first cause of the malady. The remedy is easily discovered. Let us divest ourselves of a party spirit. Let us never determine an opinion, by its agreement or disagreement with what our masters, our parents, or our teachers have inculcated, but by its conformity or contrariety to the doctrine of Jesus Christ and his Apostles. Let us never receive or reject a maxim because it favors or opposes our passions; but as it agrees with, or opposes the laws of that tribunal, the basis of which are justice and truth. Let us be fully convinced that our chief study should be to know what God determines, and to make his commands the only rules of our knowledge and practice.

[*Saurin's Sermons.*]

Digitized by Google

The Term Evangelist.

THE greatest and best of men are apt to run into extremes, even when trying to guard against them. It seems almost a matter of impossibility to avoid running into error, at all times; and for this reason, persons who make a display in the world, should, when they see they are in error, freely acknowledge it: but this is not generally the case. Persons who speak and write a great deal, generally avoid showing any error which may have occurred in their speeches or writings; and on this account many become prejudiced against those persons, though their ideas may be, in general, correct. There is no society in the *religious* world should be so careful to avoid error, as that which professes to advocate a "*restoration of the ancient order of things:*" *One* error committed by the *disciples*, will have a worse effect than *ten* errors committed by any of the sects now extant: and for this reason;—they profess to do every thing that was practised by the disciples of old; to take the word of God to mean what it says, and say what it means. Consequently, they will be looked upon by some to be purer than other people: by others they are looked upon as an unworthy, unchristian, and blasphemous sect. And it behooves them, by walking uprightly, to put to silence the ignorance of those foolish men, who say such things of them.

Under these impressions, I have thought proper to address a few lines to you, on a subject in which I think the disciples are in error. It is quite a common thing, at the present time, to call those who proclaim the Gospel to the world, "*Evangelists.*" Now I think if we look with attention to the sacred oracles, we will find that that class of laborers ceased long ago;—and, consequently, any person that takes that name upon him at the present time, "assumes an undeserved dignity."

Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, (chap. 4. verses 11, 12 & 13.) says—"And he gave some apostles; and some prophets; and some *evangelists;* and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, *unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.*" The question now presents itself,—Have we come to the unity of the faith? or, unto a perfect man? I unequivocally answer *we have.* If we have not, we *never will.* We have the will of our Heavenly Father as contained in the sayings of Christ and his Apostles, and we have no reason to look for any more revelations from Heaven: consequently, if with the sayings of Christ and his Apostles, we cannot arrive at the unity of the faith, I must say I have no reason to expect that we ever will do it in this world.—It is to be recollected that *Apostles*, as well as *Evangelists* were given till we should all come in the unity of the faith; now if *Evangelists* have not ceased, why have *Apostles* ceased to exist? Were the Evangelists to exist longer than the Apostles? The Scriptures do not warrant such an assertion. It follows, then, that both classes exist,

Digitized by Google

or, that both have ceased to exist. I think that both Apostles and Evangelists have become extinct. I cannot see what need we have for either class, so long as we have the Word of God to guide and direct us. For, recollect, in the Apostles' days, the disciples had not the Word of Truth for a guide; and if this is kept in mind, it will be easily seen of what use the Apostles and Evangelists were. And now, if what I have said is correct, it certainly behooves the disciples to leave off calling the Proclaimers, Evangelists: a name, which, in my opinion, carries too much honor with it, to be bestowed upon any person of the present age. It may be, however, that I am in error; and any of the disciples, who are of this opinion, will confer a great favor by answering this article, and show wherein I am wrong. If, however, it is not answered, I shall take it for granted that I am right.

What I have said, is intended for those who confer the title of Evangelists on Proclaimers. There are some, however, who do not go so far; but say, that they "*do the work of an Evangelist.*" To these persons I will propose a query—*Who can do the work of an Evangelist, but an Evangelist?* M. T.

PITTSBURGH, February 14, 1835.

The author of the above communication deserves credit for the conscientious frankness of his animadversions upon the supposed error of the disciples, in assuming or conferring the title of Evangelist—or even in pretending to do the work which the scriptures ascribe to such a character. Indeed, if this view of Eph. iv. 11, 12, 13. be correct, his reprehensions and expostulations would be just and seasonable. In examining this matter, we shall advert both to the meaning of the term "Evangelist," and to the duties of the person so called. And, here, let it be observed, that Euangelistes is derived from Euangelizo, which signifies to bring or publish good news, and this was the prime business of the Evangelists, as we see from the account we have of Philip, Timothy, and Titus; see Acts viii. 5. 12. and xxi. 8, 9. 2 Tim. iv. 1. Titus i. 5. and ii. 15, and iv. 1, 8, &c. Now, if we include every thing in the office of the evangelist which the meaning of the term, and the business ascribed to the occupant in the above scriptures import, we will find him to be neither more nor less, than a competent and duly authorized teacher of christianity; and, of course, an assistant and fellow-laborer with the Apostles. His duty was to preach the word, to suppress false doctrine, to organize churches, to oppose and denounce heretics, &c. &c. In short, he was to exhibit the exemplary character, and to perform all the official duties described in the three epistles addressed to Timothy and Titus. The evangelists were assistants and co-operants with the apostles, and so were the seven deacons appointed in the sixth chapter of Acts; they were also to continue their ministry after the decease of the apostles; see Tim. iv. 5, with the reasons there assigned. Now so long as those reasons exist, the office must exist; for they stand connected like cause and effect. The officer is made for the office, and not the office for the officer, especially in the divine government, which makes no provision for "sinecures, placemen, and pensioners." The office of apostles and prophets has, therefore, ceased, because their special business is accomplished; as is well expressed in the above communication; for "we have the will of our heavenly Father fully and clearly expressed in the sayings of Christ and his apostles." But is it yet fully and clearly reduced to practice? We think not. And is this *any body's* business. *No!*—according to the reasonings of our remonstrant; for, according to him, it is *every body's* business; and, therefore, *no body's*. But, are there no heathen to be evangelized—no congregations to be organized—no errors and heresies to be exposed and confronted, where there

Digitized by Google

are none disposed or qualified to do these things; and, if there be, do not the people, so circumstanced, need the labors of a Titus as much as did the people of Crete? It may be retorted, that the people in our country are already evangelized—also, that they have the written word —And so were the people in Crete, for Paul had done this; and only left Titus to set in order the things that were wanting—to ordain elders, &c. and could as easily have left them a written direction how and what to do in relation to those unfinished matters, as to have given it to Titus; and then they would have had, not only Paul's personal labors, but the written word also, as well as we. Now, surely, if apostolic epistles superadded to apostolic teaching had been sufficient, in the judgment of the Apostles, to supply the place of Evangelists, we had never heard of such characters. And does not daily experience prove the necessity and utility of such laborers? And does not the necessity of the office, justly infer the necessity of the official character, who is to perform it? For, as our remonstrant well observes, "Who can do the work of an evangelist, but an evangelist?" All this, he may say, looks fair, scriptural, and reasonable. But, then, what will we do with Eph. iv. 11, 12, 13.? Let us see. The Apostle in this passage informs us, that Christ, after his supreme exaltation, gave certain official gifts to men, which had for their ultimate end "the perfecting of the saints"—even the whole body of Christ; till *we all* come in the unity of the faith, and, in the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. What "*We*"? Why—"*we*,"—*the saints*,—"*We*"—*the body of Christ*. Surely the Apostle means what he says—means *the saints—the body of Christ*—the *whole*—not *a part* of the saints—or of the body of Christ. If, then, the saints, the body of Christ, has not yet attained the perfection here specified, it necessarily follows, that the specified offices, divinely appointed for this purpose, still remain to be occupied, as far as the case requires. But, it is alleged, that the specified offices are all done away, because the two first have ceased; viz. Apostles and Prophets. But where is the proof? The book does not say so.—Nor do subsequent facts say so. For, although, at the end of the apostolic age, we have no farther record of a succession of apostles and prophets; yet, not so of evangelists, pastors, and teachers. The qualifications and duties of these are clearly defined and inculcated: and must, of course, continue till the objects of their appointment be accomplished. The kingdom of Christ was introduced by the ministry of apostles and prophets. They were employed to set it up, to dictate its laws and ordinances, and to evince their divine origin by the gifts of the Holy Spirit, with which they were furnished; so that it is justly said to be "erected upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief—the head." But what is come of it? Where is it? A kingdom without an administration—without ministers, would be invisible—would be a paradox insolvable. And is this kingdom invested with no external relations, for the due and faithful performance of the duties for which it is responsible? And if it be, is it divested of constitutional authority to appoint officers, duly qualified, to the performance of those duties? And if not, surely, then, it must possess power to call and employ evangelists, in the true scripture import of that official epithet, seeing these were the ministers divinely appointed from the beginning for the performance of those duties. Wherefore, till the internal and external relations of the church on earth shall terminate, there must be a succession of such ministers. As to the forced and fanciful interpretation of the above quotation, which appears to have led our correspondent astray, I would just observe, that the gifts, which Christ is here said to have given to men, are official, which includes both the office and the qualifications for performing the duties of it; and that he is, therefore, said to give the officers—that all these taken together were for the perfecting of the saints, as their ultimate end:—for a work of ministry or service;—as a means to that end; viz. the building up of the body of Christ;—to a perfect man;—the thing contemplated from the beginning to be accomplished by these gifts; and here the circle closes; or, as it were, both ends meet:—the thing first proposed is achieved;

Digitized by Google

i. e. "the perfecting of the saints—to a *perfect man*—even to the measure of the stature of the *fulness* of Christ." Thus the three clauses in the 12th verse are equally ascribed to, and exclusively predicated of, the functionaries specified in the 11th;—the term *saints*, in the first clause of the 12th, being coextensive with the "*we all*," in the first clause of the 13th—that is, *the body of Christ*, its proper and immediate antecedent. Consequently, the intention of the aforesaid gifts, have an equal reference to the whole christian community, to the end of time. T. C.

LETTER FROM JAMES T. JOSLIN, TO THE EDITOR.

AMSTERDAM, N. Y. February 4, 1835.

Dear brother Campbell,

I WRITE a few lines to you to express my joy, that the truth of the gospel is gaining ground, amidst all the opposition it meets with from the various sects, who seem pledged to oppose it. What a pity! Truly, we wish they would all unite under its banner. What good might be done to the glory of God, and to their mutual happiness! For one year past I have read your Harbinger with much pleasure and profit. I feel pledged with all my heart and might to promote the reformation, in which you have been so long and so earnestly engaged. For this blessed purpose, I am exerting my humble abilities as a fellow-laborer in the good cause; neither fearing nor caring what man may say or do to me. I could here relate a mournful tale of the religious travail of my past life, which no doubt would excite both your sympathy and indignation. How many years I was kept back from the enjoyment of christian privilege, being constantly taught that I had no right to be immersed into Christ, before I had an evidence from the Spirit of God, that I was born again, and could truly say, that God for Christ's sake had forgiven my sins. Thus, for almost ten years, looking for something that God had not promised in his word, I was often well nigh driven to despair. At last, however, without possessing the desired assurance, I made up my mind to venture on the gospel, had my intention intimated to the church, was received for baptism, but had to wait a few days. But, alas! what was the exercise of my mind during this short interim! I thought to go forward not pardoned would be a great sin, and to keep back appeared chilling and dreary as death; in this horrid state of mind I went forward to the water; but thanks be to God, as soon as raised from under it, my slavish fears were gone—all was peace—I went on my way rejoicing. And even now, while I write this, I still rejoice and am thankful that, notwithstanding all my fears and dejections, I was enabled to obey the gospel of my Lord and Saviour, with whom I hope to reign in the world to come. You may see, dear brother, from this short sketch of my pilgrimage, that I have learned by dear bought experience, to pity those who live under such preposterous unscriptural teaching. O! how it relieves the sin-sick troubled mind, to have the assurance of the divine testimony, that every believing penitent has a right to be baptized for the remission of his sins, and the enjoyment of the Holy Spirit to fill him with peace and joy in believing, and of which nothing shall or can deprive him, while he continues to believe it. I mean the divine testimony, which alone can afford him just and solid ground for this blissful certainty. But I exceed my intended limits. The church in Amsterdam is but small, only forty, many of them old: but we live in peace amongst ourselves, and in the blissful hope of a glorious immortality. And now, dear brother, I hope the blessed effects you have seen and experienced from your labors of love, will engage your exertions to continue them, notwithstanding all the hard speeches, raillery, and abuse, that have been uttered against you. My prayer to God for you, myself, and all Christ's genuine disciples, is, "that we be patient in tribulation, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord"—that none of us may bring reproach upon the good cause. Your sincere friend and brother in Christ, JAMES T. JOSLIN.

OBITUARY NOTICES.

OUR much esteemed and beloved friend and brother SAMUEL MARSHAL, of the borough of Washington, Penn. departed this life on Friday, February 25th, 1835, in the 44th year of his age, after a confinement of near three months. His death was the result of a pulmonary consumption, with which he had been affected many years. He bore his last illness with christian fortitude and resignation, and died in the full hope of a blissful immortality, of which he gave satisfactory evidence to such of his religious acquaintance as conversed with him in his last illness. He will long be remembered as a zealous and faithful disciple—a benevolent and useful citizen, by a large circle of respectable friends and brethren. T. C.

BETHANY, Va. April 13th, 1835.

BELOVED BROTHER CAMPBELL,

WITH sorrow I address you, in order to inform you of the demise of one who will be long remembered and esteemed by all who knew him—one who has labored long and faithfully in the vineyard of the Lord; and by so doing, will, I feel assured, inherit that promise made to those "who turn many to righteousness: he will shine as the stars for ever and ever." The person to whom I allude is our much lamented brother PETER AINSLEY. He came to his death a few weeks since, in attempting to cross the Mattoponi river. When the ice was floating rapidly, a large piece struck the boat and crushed it, drowning brother Ainsley and two other persons who were on board with him. His body was not found until six weeks after the catastrophe. Oh! what a loss his dear family and the disciples of Jesus have sustained! But it may with truth be said, our loss is his gain. Yes, he fought the good fight and has finished his course. Henceforth there is laid up for him in heaven a crown of glory. May all the disciples imitate his labors of faith and love, is the prayer of your unworthy brother in the Lord. W. F. M. A.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number VI.——Volume VI.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. June, 1835.

CUMBERLAND RIVER, *March* 31, 1835.

To Dr. James H. Otey, Bishop of Tennessee.

Letter II.

My dear Sir,

THOUGH Bishop Onderdonk inscribes upon his banner, "*To the Law and to the Testimony,*" when he comes to the great and main issue—to the very jut of the controversy about dioscesan *bishops*—he gravely says, "The NAME Bishop, which now designates the highest grade in the ministry, is not appropriated to that office in Scripture. That name is there given to the middle order (elders) or presbyters; and all that we read in the New Testament concerning bishops (including, of course, the word *overseers* and *oversight*, which have the same derivation) is to be regarded as pertaining to that middle grade."* The Law and the Testimony, then, are on one side, and Mr. Onderdonk on the other. The word *bishop*, in the New Testament, represents not the office for which he pleads; for he candidly says in that book, it means no more than an elder of the church. But he adds, "The highest grade is there found in those called *Apostles*." Apostles, bishops, and deacons are the three grades found in the New Testament—the three episcopal grades are called bishops, presbyters, and deacons.

But the most remarkable concession which the Bishop makes, and one which does the highest honor to his candor, remains to be quoted. "It was *after* the apostolic age," says he, that the name *Bishop* was taken from the second order and appropriated to the first, as we learn from Theodoret, one of the Fathers."*

These concessions are, in my judgment, fatal to the cause of three orders of officers in the christian church, and fatal especially to the

* *Page* 12.

Digitized by Google

cause of diocesan episcopacy. Only, my dear sir, consider how much is contained in the facts stated. The facts are—

1. *Bishop* and *Elder* represented the same office in the apostolic age.

2. After the apostolic age Elders lose the name Bishop, or it is taken from them altogether; and

3. Those divinely called Apostles being dead, a class of officers occupy their place under the name which was violently taken from the elders; and now the *Bishop* is a successor, not of the first Bishops, but of the Apostles!! Of what use, then, is "the law" or "the testimony," seeing the names are changed, and a new appropriation unknown in that volume, has superseded the sacred style?

Had your friend Doctor Onderdonk, or, rather, those who introduced this new arrangement of three orders, retained the ancient names of apostles, bishops, and deacons, instead of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, the debate would have been simplified, the assumption would have been no less plausible, and the main issue would have been much more intelligible to the common people.

I cannot agree with the author of "Episcopacy tested by Scripture," that "the name is not worth a line of controversy." The world is deceived by names and governed by names. Call a shilling a crown, a captain a king, a master a lord, and there is an end to all honesty and intelligibility. If your bishops are apostles, your deacons evangelists, and your elders priests, you need not quote one passage from the New Testament. Bishop Onderdonk appears to have been sensible of this, or to have felt the babelism of his style; and, therefore, admonishes his readers that "the name is not worth a line of controversy"!! If this be true of the name, it is true of the thing. Shall we say that the difference between a *bishop of a church*, and *the bishop of a state* is not worth a line of controversy!!

"A rose," you'll say, "under any other name will smell as sweet." True; but will an apostle, under the name *bishop*, or a bishop under the name *pope*, be as acceptable and intelligible to one who makes his appeal exclusively to the law and the testimony? Our maxim is, Call Bible things by Bible names—for it is always safe; and in all important matters if the name is not in the Bible, the idea which it exactly represents will not be found there. Call Timothy and Titus *diocesan bishops*, and we now would understand them in the full import of these words; but as they are not so designated by the Apostles, we are confident that the designation suits not their work nor office, more than the word *Sultan* designates the Governor of Pennsylvania.

But it is not because a new name has been adopted, that we demur. This would have been comparatively innocent and harmless. You may call the thing called *rose*, by a new name; you may call it *dulcissima*, if you please; but should you take its appropriate name and apply it to a poppy, you would bewilder and distract, and might grossly deceive the whole community.

In my first letter to you I had occasion to say that all your writers,

Digitized by Google

as far as known to me, *assume* that succession in office, by regular descent from the Apostles, is a part, an essential part of the christian institution, and essential to the valid administration of its ordinances. But this is not the only assumption in the ground work of diocesan episcopacy. You assume *three orders* in the primitive church, making the Apostles themselves an order in the church distinct from the bishops and deacons. If this should prove an assumption, it will be as fatal to the constitution of your church as the preceding. Might not one say there are *seven* orders in the church—apostles, prophets, evangelists, teachers, directors, bishops, deacons, for the same reason that Bishop Onderdonk asserts three? The apostles were in and of themselves all orders—not one of three, but three in one. They were for a time bishops, deacons, and every thing else that the church in its infancy required. They served tables in Jerusalem, and distributed to every one as he had need. They presided in the congregations, and performed all the duties afterwards distributed amongst the bishops, deacons, and brethren.

Indeed, when the nature of a community—of any community—is better understood than it yet generally appears to be, it will be unnecessary to elaborate arguments to show that there never can be in any society but two distinct offices in reference to its usefulness and happiness—the office of *presiding*, i. e. instructing and directing; and the office of *ministering*, i. e. of executing all the wishes of the community. No two words better express these two offices than the words selected in the New Institution;—*bishops* and *deacons*, or *overseers* and *ministers*. Many individuals may partake of one or both of these offices, according to the dimensions and relations of the community; but how numerous soever the persons employed, the *offices* are but two.

Our, and all political governments in civilized countries, have three departments—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive. In the christian community Jesus is lawgiver and judge—his apostles anounce his laws and statutes—and the executive part is all that belongs to the ordinary communities, built upon the foundation, *not of bishops and deacons*, but of apostles and prophets—Jesus himself the chief corner.

That the apostles have successors in some sense, is also assumed by all the descendants of the Roman Hierarchy. Now with us, who take the Bible alone, a *successor in office* necessarily fills the place of his predecessor. John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, John Q. Adams, and Andrew Jackson, were constitutional successors of George Washington, first President of the United States. Did not they all fill the same office? Were they not all functionaries of the same authority? So of all the Governors of all constitutional states—Magistrates, Judges, Presidents of Universities, &c. &c. If, then, you, my dear sir, and all your co-ordinate diocesan bishops, are successors of the apostles, you must fill the same office and possess the same authority. You cannot claim one branch of their authority, and disclaim all the other parts and duties of their

Digitized by Google

office. You are, or are not, their successors in office. You are not half successors, or mere fragments of Apostles, but you are *Apostles of Christ* as Paul and Peter.

Bishop Onderdonk most unfortunately alludes to a secondary application of the word *Apostle*, without seeming to discover that it nullifies all his pretensions. Persons that carried alms or contributions from one community to another, are called "*the Apostles*" of that community, or of those communities which sent them. Of this you will find unequivocal evidence, 2 Cor. viii. 23. Phil. ii. Successors of such Apostles we still have, and successors in full. But Bishop Onderdonk cannot even claim to be the successor of any of these. Did these Apostles ordain? How, then, will the Bishop's conclusion stand?—"Apostles were distinguished from the Elders, because they were *superior* to them in ministerial power and rights." p. 13.

The matter, as you may readily perceive, stands thus:—The word *Apostle* means no more than one sent from or by another, *on any business whatever*. Of Apostles we have *three orders*, if you please, in the New Institution:—

1. Jesus Christ is the Apostle *of God*, and his only Apostle direct to the world. John xvii. 3, 8, 18, 21. xx. 21.

2. The twelve attendants, eye and ear witnesses of the Messiah, whom he commissioned first to the Jews; and Paul, whom he commissioned to the Gentiles, are the Apostles of *Jesus Christ*.

3. Those sent by men, by the Apostles of Jesus Christ, by the *congregations* of Christ—are also Apostles of men—Apostles of Apostles—Apostles of churches. Of these were such agents as Timothy, Titus, Sylvanus, Andronicus, Junia, and the *apostoloi toon ecclesioon*, found in the Epistles.

The last class may have successors, but not by ordination, but from mission. Jesus Christ, God's Apostle to the world, had no successor—has no vicar. The Twelve Apostles of the Lamb—the Apostles of Christ, have no successors. *The Apostles appointed by them, or by men, or by one or more churches, never were an order by themselves; and, therefore, could have no successors by descent and ordination.* We have still such officers amongst us—when any thing is to be done abroad, which the bishops and deacons cannot perform, because extra-official to their duties—they being *permanent* and *stationary* officers of one single congregation. But neither Bishop Onderdonk, nor any other Bishop, diocesan, seems to be solicitous to be the successor to the *third* class of servants, to whom the title "*Apostles*" legitimately applies.

I have too much confidence in your good sense and discrimination, and especially in your biblical attainments, to doubt that you will perceive the Doctor's agument is in ruins, the above remarks and observations being founded on incontrovertible facts and documents, obvious to all men of intelligence, who will examine a Greek New Testament, or a good translation.

As these letters may be read by many persons of limited information and attainments, and as I intend, before I dismiss the subject, to

Digitized by Google

examine every thing of note advanced by your brethren on this question; and also to make all men see what is the *scriptural order* of the christian communities called churches—I will beg your indulgence to my otherwise too great plainness of speech. And should you on any point differ from me, or think my arguments inconclusive, it will give me great pleasure to lay before my readers any thing you may have the goodness to write on the subject.

Most respectfully, I remain, &c.

A. CAMPBELL.

Reply to a Reformed Clergyman---No. 2.

BY S. M. M'CORKLE, A LAYMAN.

THE Reformed Clergyman charges the Layman with reasoning too much from analogy. He has forgotten how soon in his essays he compared eccentric geniuses to eccentric orbs, necessarily small. He evades the force of arguments drawn from types or analogies, by running them beyond their legitimate length, or by turning them into ridicule, and calling them "romantic things." He says, "Is the antitype of temporal judgments, temporal judgments?" He might as well have asked me if men 3000 years ago were types of men now on earth. Men are the same kind of beings, and judgments the same they were when God first began to inflict the scourge upon disobedience. I labor not to prove judgments to be the types of judgments, but the result of disobedience, in the type or the antitype. According to our friend's logic, he can rule faith, obedience, rewards, as well as judgments, out of the present dispensation. They cannot be the antitype of faith, obedience, rewards, &c. in the typical dispensation. Faith, obedience, &c. are just as typical as judgments. Judgments are not types, but the result of disobedience, as much so in the antitype as the type. But we reason from analogy, that if disobedience in the typical dispensation was followed by judgments and a dissolution, may it not be expected in the other?—Judgments being not an appendage of either dispensation, but a result. That the type closed in judgments, and that the antitype must close in something superior, is, indeed, a logical conclusion, and will save a world of trouble, if our brother can establish the fact, that judgments are incompatible with the present dispensation, because a typical dispensation closed its existence under the scourge of Heaven! This will, indeed, be a fortunate safeguard from dissolution; while at the same time our friend *consistently* admits "the typical character both of the religion and the history of the people of the Jews." According to his arguments, the history of the Jewish church was typical until it comes to a close; the typical character then ceases, because judgments cannot be the types of judgments!

Our friend discards the notion of relying on types, or reasoning from analogy; yet on a type is suspended his whole hope of a *church*

Digitized by Google

resurrection—of his church coming up out of the wilderness. His typical church came up out of the wilderness a thousand years before it went into Babylon—his typified church a thousand years after it has gone into Babylon, *comes* up out of the *wilderness!!* There is some difficulty here; but clerical blunders are more pardonable than those made by common sense. Will our brother tell us where or what is the wilderness out of which the present church is to come? If I have not grossly misunderstood him, he does "confound" Babylon and the wilderness, when he asks, "Did God's ancient church never come up out of the wilderness? And may I not add, that if the history of the Jews be a type of the history of the Gentile church; and the Jews were delivered from literal Babylon, must we believe that the Christian church, now in Babylon, is never to come out of Babylon," &c.

Now suppose we test this logic by the Bible; for it is certainly implied in the above quotation that Babylon and the wilderness are the same thing. "And to the woman (the christian church) were given two wings of a great eagle," to facilitate her flight into Babylon! Out of which she is again called to fly: "Come out of her my people." "Is there not a war between his doctrine of types" and the word?

Suppose we admit the Jewish return from Babylon is to have an antitype in the christian church. The Jews after their return were under perpetual harrass and bondage: they were under the Medes and Persians, suffered extremely from the Grecians, enslaved, and finally destroyed by the Romans. Woe to the christian church, if this be its typical character!

Our friend remonstrates against "the loose style in which the Layman speakes of types, and his application of a typical character to God's judgments," &c. If our brother has put off his clerical coat, he has perhaps retained the glasses. On a second and impartial reading, perhaps he may not find one passage in the essays making the judgments which befel the Jewish church typical. Our brother should not "confound" types and analoges. "Typical gospel," "typical dispensation," are common expressions—"Judgments attended the close of the former, and, *according to prophecy*, will attend the close of the present"—"that the faults and fate of the one is, and will be, the faults and fate of the other." Thus the Layman reasoned from analogy; but no where has he directly or indirectly said that judgments are the types of judgments. The conclusion is "arbitrary, far-fetched, and forced." How can our friend separate this very conclusion from his own premises, that the christian dispensation is to close—to end in sore judgments—when not "disputing against the typical character both of the religion and of the history of the people of the Jews." Now, how far must the *history* of the two dispensations agree, and still be typical?

Our friend says, "On what authority does he [the Layman] so frequently call the Christian church the Gentile church?" Just on the invincible fact that God's moral government on earth at this time

Digitized by Google

is truly and positively in the hands of Gentile nations—not a Jew to be found in its jurisdiction; and Paul says that "blindness in part is happened to the Jews, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Beyond the control of argument or contradiction, the the Jews universally hold the Christian religion in abhorrence, have no lot nor part in it. And, above all, the Master said to the Jewish people as a church, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." Now, sir, by what authority will you call it any thing else? It It will open a new field for spiritualizing, and require proficients indeed to make out the occupants of the christian dispensation to be Jews!

Farther, I am charged with attributing "a much greater amount of ignorance to the priesthood than can possibly be sustained by any written documents." *Written documents!* a *tithe* of the ignorance of the priesthood does not appear on paper. I have most specially charged the pulpit with ignorance, but the ignorance of our learned expositors is no less notorious, and far less pardonable.

The Clergyman animadverts on the following passage:—"The most alarming and the most misapplied passage in the whole Bible may be found Rev. vii. 12, to the end, (meaning the sixth seal.) Our priests almost universally quote the propheey as a portrait of the final day." "These," says he, "must be very ignorant priests, indeed," &c.—"Perhaps, he means only Indiana priests.* Certainly, he cannot find any person of note, living or dead, who affirms that the sixth seal alludes to the final consummation." Now, sir, you must have lived in a favored land, if you have not heard the passage referred to a thousand times from the pulpit as a portrait of the judgment day. Where the man, woman, or child in our nation, who has not heard it reiterated often, about sinners calling upon the rocks and mountains to hide them in their great and terrific doomsday; and full often do they have these rocks *melted!* These things are as familiar with mankind as priest or pulpit, and as hackneyed a sentiment as ever was repeated by priests. Addison was guilty of making his Cato say, "The war of elements, the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds." *I* happen to have Scott at hand. The learned

* Now, brother, you owe an apology to the public for this remark. Ignorance is not confined to state lines, except those states in the which priests rule both church and state. Very many of our priests are emigrants from other states. About four years have I lived in the state—have heard but few of those things called sermons; the few, just like those which I have been hearing for almost half a century—not more remarkable for ignorance—one only recollected to have been *charged with "melted rocks"*—the priest a *presiding elder*. Many of our clergy know the meaning of *hic, hoc*—perhaps, a criterion of wisdom with our brother.

Since penning the above, the writer happened within the orbit of one of those great ones of the earth, called *Bishops*. In his preachment he talked about sinners calling upon the rocks and mountains to hide them in the final day—the same old hackneyed tale, which no doubt our worthy friend has heard a thousand times.

Digitized by Google

expositor says on this sixth seal, "These events are emblems and anticipations of the end of the world and the day of judgment."

Now suppose we examine how the wise and learned have disposed of this sixth seal; and if their application be not much more ridiculous than that of applying it to the close of time, I will yield my pretensions to common sense. Scott applies it to the prostration of heathen idolatry: "The departure of the heaven, like the rolling up of a parchment to be laid aside, and the removal of the mountains and islands, seem to have represented the total subversion of the pagan persecuting dominion." In Scott I find the following quotation from Bishop Newton: "The great lights of the heathen world, the powers, civil and ecclesiastical, were all eclipsed and obscured; the heathen emperors and Cesars were slain; the heathen priests and augurs were extirpated; the heathen officers and magistrates were removed; the heathen temples demolished," &c. A. Clarke follows the same road. Hear him: "The *sun*, the ancient pagan government of the Roman empire, was wholly darkened; and like a *black hair sackcloth*, was degraded and humbled to the dust. The *moon*, the ecclesiastical state of the same empire," &c. *Stars of heaven*, the gods and goddesses, demigods, and deified heroes," &c. Much more trash or learned *nonsense* might be quoted. This will suffice. "*Great lights of the heathen world.*" Reader, dont you think that divine inspiration, if speaking about heathen worship and idolatry, would have called it "*great heathen darkness*"? But according to our priests and commentators, *heathen idolatry, by divine inspiration, is called heaven!* The worship of devils, stocks, and stones compared to *heaven*, a place of holiness!! Gods, demigods, and goddesses called the stars of heaven!! Who dare palm such inconsistencies on the God of truth? At one time he is forbidding idolatry, punishing his creatures for worshipping Baal, Moloch, or Ashtaroth; anon, he is comparing the same worship—heathen idolatry, to the place of his abode!! *Heathen idolatry called heaven?!* It is a libel on the God of truth—a slander upon infinite purity!! Whose heaven is alluded to by the Apostle? God's heaven? Or did it belong to Vulcan, Pluto, or Rhadamanthus? Give me the absurdities of a thousand stars falling to our little world, or burning earth and ocean with fire, in preference to palming such monstrous absurdities upon infinite wisdom. "Tell it not in Gath!" The whims of Swedenborg, the famous book of Mormon, or the stories of Sinbad not more unfeasible. No event did ever take place in the Roman empire, nor in any other kingdom since the creation, which would justify the use of such a figure. Which of the systems deserve the palm—that of applying the sixth seal to the day of judgment, or to the prostration of heathen idolatry in the Roman empire?

I am charged with confounding "antichrist" and the "man of sin." Common acceptation has applied the term *antichrist* to the Roman Catholic Church—rarely to Sceptics. I apply the term to any religious community, whose laws are opposed to, or exalted above, the law of Christ—not many exempt. The Layman's "comments are sometimes most arbitrary, and so far-fetched and forced, that they are

Digitized by Google

destitute of even plausibility." Assertions are not quite of equal weight to logical arguments; but are very hard to answer, except by assertions. The above must go without an answer.

I approach the Clergyman on the subject of the first resurrection with very different feelings from those felt when on the subject of the sixth seal—the ignorance of the priests and commentators. I do not anticipate easy victory; but relying on the simple meaning of the Holy Book and common sense, I shrink not from the task.

As our friend is standing up for the priests, I would like to hear him give some plausible excuse why they are, (especially the orthodox, so called) "almost universally opposed to the doctrine of Christ's second coming. Christ's second coming and the resurrection of the martyrs is inseparably connected. Our friend places much reliance on Ezekiel's vision. The prophet explains the figure, and it is evidently in the future. The Clergyman asks, "If the Jewish church was to have a resurrection out of her graves, may not the christian church have a similar resurrection?" If Ezekiel's resurrection be in the future, the Jewish church is a proper subject of a spiritual resurrection, being emphatically dead.

Suppose we carry out the analogy. Is the christian church to be brought down to the abodes of death—to be buried? Short of this, she cannot be a proper subject of resurrection. Short of this, it will be nothing but a revival; and as I have before observed, we may safely render the passage thus, "Blessed and holy is he that hath a part in the first *revival*." The clergy would make wry faces, indeed, to have all their revivals taken from them at one sweep—to have it proved that there has been no such thing as a revival since the introduction of the christian religion.

Now if this be a spiritual resurrection which is to take place, it must necessarily be preceded by a spiritual death. When is this death to take place? There can be no room for it. The resurrection must take place without a death. Our clergy will not suffer it to be in the future—in the past it cannot be identified.

Believe the pulpit and the press, and you would suppose the church to be in the midst of her *spiritual resurrection, without a death?* Make this death in the future, and you must contradict pulpit and press. The good doing, and the mighty exertions to spread the gospel and evangelize the world, is to bring in the glories of millennial perfection. The dawn appears, and is gradually to rise and brighten into noontide splendor. This is hoped—is believed. Make the death in the past, and who knew any thing about it? When was it? None to answer the question. An insensible death—a like resurrection! Brother, reconcile these discrepancies. That a death is to precede this resurrection, is neither "far-fetched nor forced"—and a death by violence. Is the whole church to be "beheaded for the witness of Jesus"? If not, the church cannot be alluded to in the passage. Our friend has a "loose" way of examining the prophecies; and before he can apply the passage to the church, he must show that the church can be spiritually beheaded for "the witness of Jesus

Digitized by Google

and for the worship of God." Then may he apply it to the church and a spiritual *resurrection*.

Will our friend tell us who the four living creatures are? Are they the spirits of the martyrs also, which are to be revived? According to our friend's "doctrine of analogies," they cannot be literal beings; but are principles or qualities—*to wit*, holiness, faith, hope, charity; which have neither souls nor bodies, hands nor tongues; yet they are singing and acknowledging redemption through the blood of the Lamb! "and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, *and we shall reign on the earth*." Reader, mark this—"*Reign on the earth*." Had they ever been on earth before? Where were they when redeemed? When are they to reign? Over whom are they to reign? Most likely over "men, women, and children," and will no doubt form a part of those alluded to, Rev. xxii. "But they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years"—not "three hundred thousand."

Now as our friend has been a clergyman, may I not conclude that he is well versed in metaphysics, can prove a nonentity, or that which is equivalent—can prove that faith, hope, charity, mere qualities which never had, and never can have an abstract existence, can be beheaded, can sit in judgment, can worship the beast or his image, can receive the mark of the beast in their foreheads or in their hands!! That which can worship can be martyred—that which can be martyred may be resurrected.

As our friend relies much upon Ezekiel's vision, we will see if the Prophet can sustain him. How is the Prophet's vision to be accomplished, figuratively or literally? Our friend says, "Figuratively, indeed." Figures are never used to represent figures, but facts. The simple meaning of the Prophet is this: He uses a figure to represent a fact; the dispersion of the Jews among the nations, and their return to their own land—as literal a thing as ever did, or will take place on earth; and as fair an explanation of the resurrection of the dry bones as was ever given; instead of our friend's "figurative resurrection." The "figurarive resurrection" took place in the *vision*, not in the *accomplishment*. Our friend still retains the "odor of his first wine." The clergy generally, in matters of religion, have the wrong end foremost—"the cart before the horse."

The two witnesses are brought in to support the theory of a "figurative resurrection." When the two witnesses can be identified they may afford arguments for or against a proposition. I have yet to hear a reasonable theory about them. A "figurative resurrection" must be antecedent to something which is to follow—something literal, or we may "figure" *ad infinitum*.

The idea of mortality and immortality inhabiting the same world, is turned into ridicule by our friend; the fact of Christ associating after his resurrection, forty days with men in the flesh, excepted, I suppose. Let common sense decide which is most ridiculous—the idea that immortality is always in heaven; that our world is one of the "many mansions" of heaven; that infinity of space is to be

Digitized by Google

peopled eternally by intelligent beings, progressing into immortality according to some known law of Omnipotence, answering the design of creation by being active, performing service: or to think that the innumerable inhabitants of innumerable worlds are to be congregated into some vast theatre or plane, in extent surpassing all human conception, literally covered with living beings eternally. I speak as a man: the mind revolts at the idea of being posted on the extremity, or of being crowded in a centre, and seeks an outlet.

For what purpose will you congregate all living beings into one group, depopulate space, and leave creation a solitary waste? The great temple in which God is to be worshipped and adored, and which is every where present, is as wide as creation. Brother, "if weak thy reason," plod along with the priesthood, who have been "almost universally" wrong; congregate all living beings into one place called *heaven;* burn our globe with fire; blot out suns and stars, and leave "*primeval darkness*" *a wide dominion, immeasurable space!*

Our friend, after dissecting John's vision, winds up with a conclusion which puts all to rest: "But all is veiled in figures." I suppose God has given us an incomprehensible something, and called it *Revelation!* "Visions," says he, "are always in figure, and they must be understood figuratively, if understood at all." Here again, figures and their accomplishment, are *confounded,* or I do not understand the brother. A figurative meaning of a figure is a little beyond my ken. A literal *meaning* of a *figure* I can gather by the two ends. If my recollection serves me right, in all God's word a figurative meaning of a figure is not to be found. The woman clothed with the *sun;* a figure—literally, the church. Star fell from heaven; a figure—literally, the man of sin, or the first universal Bishop. Many examples might be given.

Our friend thinks the doctrine of a first resurrection should be received with "caution." Primitive christians were not quite so scrupulous about believing the dangerous doctrine, especially the martyrs. Not more than forty years after John, the doctrine was believed on the authority of the Apostle. Justin Martyr is quoted: "A man among us, by name John, one of the Apostles of Christ, in the revelation made to him, has prophesied that the believers in our Christ shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem; and after that shall be the general, and, in a word, the eternal resurrection and judgment of all together." This is an old heresy, propagated by those who lived in John's age—believed by the church in its pure age—long since rejected—turned by the wise and *learned,* so *called,* into an *ignis fatuus.*

Coming of the Son of Man.

JAMESTOWN, O. February 16, 1835.

Beloved brother Campbell,

I HAVE just examined again our Lord's words as recorded by Matt. xvi. 28.—"Indeed, I say to you, some of those who are present shall not taste death till they see the Son of Man enter upon his reign."

Digitized by Google

This they saw when they saw him ascend to heaven, and it was a literal sight. He did not say that any of them should live to see what he expressed just before—viz. *"For the Son of Man, vested with his Father's glory, shall come hereafter with his heavenly messengers, and recompence every one according to his actions."*—QUERY. Is the coming here spoken of personal and literal, or is it figurative? If it be personal and literal, then the dispute will be about the time when it will take place. M'Corkle and others affirm that it will be at the beginning of the Millennium; and our "Reformed Clergyman" and others, that it will take place at the general judgment.

I have not understood Paul, else there are two resurrections and two judgments yet future. At the first (the dead saints) those that are Christ's, shall be raised, and the living saints shall be changed (glorified) and both together shall arise and meet him in the air; at which time those who are alive on the earth, who know not God, and have not obeyed the gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be banished from his presence, &c. After which (at the end of the thousand years) the rest of the dead shall be raised and judged. This judgment will have nothing to do with the subjects of the first resurrection, with such as had believed and obeyed the gospel before the coming of Christ in his glorified state, nor will the second death have any thing to do with them.

Paul certainly intimates that there are two resurrections yet future, and that Christ will re-appear or come again to the earth at the first of them; but he does not say or intimate that he will go back to heaven again before the second or final resurrection and judgment; but that after he has returned and subdued all his enemies, and judged first the living, and afterwards the dead—then he shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, and he himself shall then become a subject. This may be a misunderstanding of the matter; but so I have understood the Apostle Paul.

As ever, yours,

M. WINANS.

P. S. There is certainly a very great difference between the seeing of Jesus begin his reign, and the seeing of him come in the glory of the Father, accompanied with the angels of heaven. I conclude that the angels will be seen, as well as the Lord, else it cannot be told when the prediction is fulfilled. M. W.

Creeds and Councils.

THE following extracts from Mr. J. M. DUNCAN's new book on Creeds, will remind our readers of the roots of all sectarian discords, and of our essays on this topic in the *Christian Baptist*. The disciples should all be enlightened on this subject:— EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

In his introduction, and when detailing the subjects of which he conceived himself called to treat, Mosheim remarks, "In that part of sacred history which relates to the doctrines of christianity, it is necessary, above all things, to inquire particularly into the degree of authority that has been attributed to the sacred writings, in all the different periods of the church; and also into the manner in which the divine doctrines they contain have been explained and illustrated. For the true state of religion in every age can only be learned from the point of view in which these sacred oracles were considered, and from the manner in which they were expounded to the people. *As long as they were the only rule of faith, religion preserved its native purity;* and in proportion as their decisions were either neglected or postponed to the inventions of men, it degenerated from its primitive and divine simplicity."*

"The method of teaching the sacred doctrines of religion was, at this time, most simple, far removed from all the subtle rules of philosophy, and all the precepts of human art. This appears abundantly, not only in the writings of the apostles, but also in all those of the second century, which have survived the ruins of time. *Neither did the apostles, or their disciples,* ever think of collecting into *a regular system* the principal doctrines of the christian religion, or of demonstrating them in a scientific and geometrical *order.* The beautiful and candid simplicity of these early ages rendered such philosophical niceties *unnecessary;* and the great study of those who embraced the gospel, was rather to express its divine influence in their dispositions and actions, than to examine its doctrines with an excessive curiosity, or to explain them by the *rules of human wisdom.*

"There is, indeed, extant a brief *summary* of the principal doctrines of christianity in that *form,* which bears the name of *The Apostles' Creed,* and which, from the *fourth* century downwards, was almost generally considered as a production of the Apostles. All, however, who have the least knowledge of antiquity, look upon this opinion as entirely false and destitute of all foundation. There is much more reason and judgment in the opinion of those who think that this creed was not all composed at once; but from small beginnings was imperceptibly augmented, in proportion to the growth of heresy, and according to the exigencies and circumstances of the church, from whence it was designed to banish the errors that daily arose."†

This historian has nothing to report of the ecclesiastic *creeds* of the early ages. He affirms that the apostles did not make a creed; that their disciples did not make one; that there was no necessity for any such thing; that as long as the Bible was the *only* rule of faith, religion flourished in its native purity; but that it degenerated whenever the decisions of the sacred oracles were postponed to the inventions of men; that human *hearts* were then the *depositories* of truth, and the *lives* of men its *witnesses;* and that the brief document, called

* *Eccles. Hist. Int. p.* 5. † *Vol* 1, *pp.* 113, 114.

Digitized by Google

"The Apostles' Creed," obtained its ecclesiastical eminence in, or about the *fourth* century.

Du Pin, a Catholic historian, refers to the apostles the *doctrine* contained in the document called "The Apostles' Creed," but demonstrably proves that they never framed its *form*.

In another place the same author affirms, that "every bishop instructed his own people in the true faith of the church, and confuted all sorts of errors by the authority of scripture and tradition, in the first three ages of the church."

The same Romanist historian proves at considerable length—

1. That there was no *creed*, other than the Bible, handed down from the apostles: of course there is no divine precedent for such an instrument.

2. That there was "no regulated and established" *form* of faith derived from any other source, during the first three ages.

3. That creeds were so abundant as to be as numerous as *authors;* nay, that the same author expressed the creed, found in his own works, in different words in different places; a fact which leaves a creed as "a form of sound words" out of sight.

4. That the term *creed*, as used in the writings of the fathers, does not mean what the term means now—an accredited, permanent, written document; but the *doctrine* as opposed to the *form*.

5. That the creed, as the term was used, was "imprinted on the mind"—"was not written on paper, or with ink, but was engraved on the fleshly tables of the heart." *Afterwards*, and as a mere aid to memory, certain forms were compiled, but by whom no one can tell.

6. There seem to have been certain *churches—three* the author adduces from Ruffinus, and doubts not that there were many others who had written formularies. When they first compiled these instruments, or who was their author, he appears not to know. It was the general habit among the bishops, for each one to instruct his own flock, and to resist error by the scriptures and by tradition. So that these creeds, even when found in churches, at a late period (afterwards) were mere assistants to memory, and for instruments of ecclesiastical power. But to this point I may have occasion to return again.

Sir Peter King, an Episcopalian, in his inquiry into the constitution of the primitive church, after having collected and studied all the ancient creeds—"whole creeds and pieces of creeds"—which he had met with in the first three centuries, remarks:—

"And here, since we have mentioned the *symbol*, it will be no unuseful digression to inquire a little into the ancient creeds; for as that creed which is commonly called "The Apostles'," all learned persons now are agreed that it was never composed by them, neither do I find it within my prescribed time.‡ But though they had not that, yet they had other creeds very like thereunto, which contained the fundamental articles of the christian faith, unto which all christians gave their assent and consent, and that publicly at baptism;

‡ *The three first centuries.*

Digitized by Google

whence, as before, it is called by Cyprian, *the law of the symbol*, and by Novatian, *the rule of truth*.

"This creed was handed down from father to son, as a brief summary of the necessary scripture truths, not *in ipsissimis verbis*, or in the same set words, but only the sense or substance thereof; which is evident, from hence, that we never find the creed twice repeated in the same words; no, not by one and the same father."

I remark here, 1st. That his lordship has not furnished us with any established or regular "form of sound words;" but those forms which change and vary under the pen of the same father. 2. He agrees with Mosheim and Du Pin as to the Apostles' Creed: he finds it not in the three first centuries.

The second example of an early creed, which I shall furnish, is from the closet of Gregory Thaumaturgus. Dr. Miller has quoted it in his letters on unitarianism. It may be found also in Cave's lives of the fathers, and Du Pin's history. It is among those enumerated by King, and Dr. Mosheim refers to it as "a brief summary of the christian religion." It is as follows: "There is one God, the Father of the living Word, of the subsisting wisdom and power, and of Him who is his eternal image; the perfect begotten of him that is perfect, the Father of the only begotten Son. There is one Lord, the Only of the Only, God of God, the character and image of the godhead; the powerful Word, the comprehensive Wisdom, by which all things were made, and the power that gave being to the whole creation: the true Son of the true Father; the Invisible of the Invisible; the Incorruptible of the Incorruptible; the Immortal of the Immortal; and the Eternal of Him that is Eternal. There is one Holy Ghost, having its subsistence of God, which appeared through the Son to mankind; the perfect Image of the perfect Son; the life-giving Life; the holy Fountain; the Sanctity and the Author of sanctification; by whom God the Father is made manifest; who is over all and in all; and God the Son who is through all. A *perfect Trinity*, which neither in glory, eternity, nor wisdom, is divided or separated from itself."

The foregoing has been denominated, "the celebrated confession of faith of Gregory Thaumaturgus. The circumstance which especially entitles it to notoriety, deserves to be made known. I shall take the account of it from Dr. Cave's biographic sketch of the bishop. It seems that Gregory was called to fulfil the duties of a particular position, to which he was incompetent. Heresies, grievous and perplexing, had spread themselves over the countries, where the scene of his episcopal labors had been laid out. He himself was "altogether unexercised in theological studies, and the mysteries of religion." By what "test of orthodoxy" he had been admitted into the ministry, we are not told. Perhaps there was none but the Bible, or some trivial "symbols," which had not yet attained that eminence. But, under his difficulty, and "for remedy thereof, he is said to have had immediate assistance from Heaven. For while one night he was deeply considering of these things, and discussing matters of faith in his own mind, he had a vision, wherein two august and venerable

Digitized by Google

persons, whom he understood to be St. John the Evangelist, and the blessed Virgin, appeared in the chamber where he was, and discoursed before him concerning those points of faith, which he had before been debating with himself. After whose departure, he immediately penned than canon and rule of faith which they had declared, and which he ever after made the standard of his doctrine, and bequeathed as an inestimable legacy and depositum to his successors."

Councils did not arise in the church for some time after the apostles had closed their labors and gone to their rest. The strong sense of personal liberty with which they had inspired their disciples, and the habits of independence which resulted from the constitution of the churches, could not be destroyed very speedily; but must be assailed insidiously, and overcome gradually. The people at large would at first resist. When they were quelled, men of strong intellect, upright intentions, and firm purpose, must next be removed out of the way: and that would not be a very easy task. But when the feeling of social and moral honor grew feeble, when the spirit of evangelical enterprize was lost, or, to use the language of one of the fathers, "when the blood of Christ was no longer warm in the veins of the disciples," then the deteriorating process commenced. Du Pin says—

"In the first three ages of the church, these assemblies were more rare, and less remarkable, than they were in the following centuries; as well because the continual persecutions of the emperors hindered the bishops from meeting freely and in public; as also because the tradition of the apostles being as yet fresh in men's memories, it was not supposed necessary to summon a council for the establishing of every truth, and condemnation of every error. Hence it is, that we don't find in any credible authors, that any councils were held to condemn the first heretics. The errors of these heretics were looked upon with horror by all the christians; who considered the authors of them, and likewise those that maintained them, as persons already excommunicated; and separated from the church, without the solemnity and trouble of convening a synod to excommunicate them by name. In short, *every bishop* instructed his own people in the true faith of the church, and confuted all sorts of errors by *the authority of scripture and tradition.*

"The first councils that are mentioned in antiquity are those that were held under the pontificate of Pope Victor, to adjust the celebrated controversy about keeping Easter; and some others that were assembled almost at the same time to suppress the growing faction of the Montanists."

Mosheim informs us, that there "does not appear, in the first century, the smallest trace of that association of provincial churches, from which *councils* and metropolitans derive their origin. It was only in the *second* century that the custom of holding councils commenced in Greece, from whence it soon spread through the other provinces."

Digitized by Google

Again, and referring to the second century, he says—"During a great part of this century, the christian churches were entirely *independent* of each other; nor were they joined together by *association*, *confederacy*, or any other bonds but those of *charity*. Each christian assembly was a little state, governed by its own laws, which were either enacted, or, at least, approved by the society. But, in process of time, all the christian churches of a province were formed into one large ecclesiastical body, which, like confederate states, assembled at certain times, in order to deliberate about the common interests of the whole. This institution had its origin among the Greeks, with whom nothing was more common than this confederacy of independent states, and the regular assemblies which met, in consequence thereof, at fixed times, and were composed of the deputies of each respective state. But these ecclesiastical associations were not long confined to the Greeks; their great utility was no sooner perceived, than they became universal, and were formed in all places where the gospel had been planted. To these assemblies, in which the deputies, or commissioners of several churches, consulted together, the name of *synods* was appropriated by the Greeks, and that of *councils* by the Latins; and the laws that were enacted, in these general meetings, were called *canons*, i. e. rules.

"These councils, of which we find not the smallest trace before the middle of this century, *changed* the whole face of the church, and gave it *a new form*; for by them the ancient privileges of the *people* were considerably diminished, and the *power* and authority of the bishops greatly augmented. The humility, indeed, and prudence of of these pious prelates prevent their assuming *all at once* the *power* with which they were *afterwards* invested. At their *first* appearance in these general councils, they acknowledged that they were no more than the *delegates* of their respective churches, and that they acted in the name, and by the appointment of the *people*. But they soon changed this humble tone, imperceptibly extended the limits of their *authority*, turned their influence into *dominion*, and their councils into *laws;* and openly asserted at length, that *Christ had empowered them to prescribe to his people authoritative rules of faith and manners.*

"Another effect of these councils was, the gradual abolition of that perfect equality, which reigned among all bishops in the primitive times. For the order and decency of these assemblies required that some one of the provincial bishops met in council, should be invested with a superior degree of *power* and authority; and hence the rights of *metropolitans* derive their origin. In the mean time the bounds of the church were enlarged; the custom of holding councils was followed wherever the sound of the gospel had reached; and the universal church had now the appearance of one vast republic, formed by a combination of a great number of little states. This occasioned the creation of a new order of ecclesiastics, who were appointed, in different parts of the world, as heads of the church; and whose office it was to preserve the consistence and union of that immense body, whose members were so widely dispersed throughout the nations. Such was

Digitized by Google

the nature and office of the *patriarchs*, among whom, at length, ambition, being arrived at its most insolent period, formed a new dignity, investing the bishop of Rome and his successors with the title and authority of *Prince of the Patriarchs*."

Surely the community cannot be aware of these things, or they would not look with so much complacency on presbyteries, synods, conferences, conventions, and assemblies. Can it be possible, that knowing these things, *the people* should be indifferent to the history of their own degradation? But to proceed.

The late Dr. Wilson of Philadelphia, in his work on "the primitive government of christian churches," remarks—"We learn from Tertullian, in the third century, that councils were collected in certain places throughout the Greek cities, from all the churches, by which the higher matters were managed in common, and the representation itself of the whole christian persuasion, was regarded with high respect. Because, when synods were introduced, the churches were represented by delegates; and as this was among the Greeks only, it has been conjectured that they took the idea from their own civil forms. The practice was certainly founded on common consent, since they were neither at first of appellative jurisdiction, nor founded on scriptural authority. Cyprian did not neglect to avail himself of means, so well adapted to enhance clerical influence and *power*, to which he was so much inclined. In Africa, therefore, they soon became frequent; and their members, gradually losing sight of the representation of their churches, considered themselves as acting by virtue of their offices."

I have thus traced the rise of ecclesiastical *power;* and have shown it to have constructed its claims upon the despoiled privileges of individual conscience, which are the rights of man. I have pointed out its gradual advances, while christians became sluggish, and bishops grew ambitious; and shown the awful extreme of despotic sway to which it hastened in those first ages of christianity, to which appeals are often made with more confidence than wisdom. The reader must have distinctly observed that retrograde movement in spiritual things, which degraded the church from the dignified simplicity of being under law to Christ; dressed her off in the meretricious attire of human institutions; and exchanged the glorious principles of the new covenant for the forbidding peculiarities of a human compact. He must have recognized in the altered form of the church, the unity of the church expounded as a *political* principle, instead of that pure, spiritual, ethereal subsistence, denominated "the unity of the Spirit." And he has reached the origin of those instruments of ecclesiastical *power* under consideration—those authoritative rules of faith and manners, which have so completely usurped the place of the Bible, as tests of orthodoxy. It is just as I have said—"The priesthood being changed, there is of necessity a change also of the *law*." The Bible, not recognizing councils, nor the offices which they create, has made no legislative provision for either. And hence it is, that there are such differences of opinion about the form of

Digitized by Google

church government; while many suppose that the scriptures have prescribed no form at all, but have left it all to the changes of expediency.

The last quotation, from the pages of Mosheim's ecclesiastical history, covers the whole ground, which, in pursuing this discussion, I have to traverse, and is a little ahead of my argument. The *councils*, whose origin has been so distinctly traced, and whose pathway to eminence and power was over the rights of the *people*; which completely changed the *popular* character of the church, as it had flourished under biblical influence, and which threw religion into the hands of a spiritual aristocracy; made *canons*, or rules in abundance: but I have not discovered, so far as the opportunities of examination have been afforded, any *creed*—or exhibition of "scriptural doctrines in regular order"—which any of them framed before the council of *Nice*. That instrument of ecclesiastical operation, was so perfectly monarchical in its spirit, that the church does not seem to have been prepared for it; until her members had been accustomed to "the pomp and circumstance" of royalty, displayed around her own altars: until some reigning despot should perceive the similitude to his own institutions, and, apprehending a rival in the person of an ecclesiastic, should avail himself of some occurring circumstance, to grasp the whole: and then a *creed* came in, the offspring of a union between church and state, enacted and sustained by the signature of a political sovereign. I return again to the historian.

Mosheim, in his account of the *third* century, writes—"The face of things began to change in the christian church. The ancient method of ecclesiastical government, seemed in general, still to subsist; while, at the same time, by imperceptible steps, it varied from the primitive rule, and degenerated towards the form of a *religious monarchy*. For the bishops aspired to higher degrees of *power* and authority than they had formerly possessed; and not only violated the rights of the *people*, but also made gradual encroachments upon the privileges of the *presbyters*. And that they might cover these usurpations with an air of justice, and an appearance of reason, they published *new doctrines* concerning *the nature of the church* and of *the episcopal dignity;* which, however, were in general, so obscure, that they themselves seem to have understood them as little as those to whom they were delivered. One of the principal authors of this change, in the government of the church, was Cyprian, who pleaded for the power of the bishops with more zeal and vehemence, than had ever been hitherto employed in that cause, though not with an unshaken constancy and perseverance; for in difficult and perilous times *necessity sometimes obliged him to yield, and to submit several things to the judgment and authority of the church.*

Again—"The bishops assumed, in many places, a *princely authority*, particularly those who had the *greatest number* of churches under their inspection, and who presided over the most *opulent* assemblies. They appropriated to their evangelical function *the splendid ensigns* of temporal majesty. A *throne*, surrounded with ministers, exalted

above his equals, the servants of the meek and humble Jesus; and *sumptuous garments* dazzled the eyes and minds of the multitude into an ignorant veneration for their arrogant authority. The example of bishops was ambitiously imitated by the presbyters; who, neglecting the sacred duties of their station, abandoned themselves to the indolence and delicacy of an effeminate and luxurious life. The deacons, beholding the presbyters deserting thus their functions, boldly usurped their rights and privileges; and the effects of a *corrupt ambition* were spread through every rank of the sacred order."

So much for the third *century*. In the *fourth* appeared *Constantine the Great*. A circumstance occurred, inviting his attention to, and his interference with, ecclesiastical matters, which reminds one of the visit paid to Gregory Thaumaturgus, by "the Apostle John and the blessed Virgin," when he formed his celebrated confession of faith. A miraculous *cross* was seen in the air. This was enough. Constantine was converted, and, to the universal joy of christians, became the *Patron* of the church. But this new ecclesiastical *Head* was very far from leading a religious life, or glorying in the *cross* of the Lord Jesus; and, instead of breaking up the dominion over the human conscience, which had been established by the ambitious *episcopacy*, and subservient *councils*, he confirmed and extended it, appropriating to himself the pre-eminence. "Though he permitted the church to remain a body politic, distinct from that of the state, as it had formerly been, yet he assumed to himself the supreme power over this sacred body, and the right of modelling and governing it in such a manner as should be most conducive to *the public good*. This right he enjoyed without any opposition, as none of the bishops presumed to call his authority in question."

At this juncture, and under these circumstances, Constantine called together the Synod, or Council, of *Nice*. It was denominated "*œcumenical*," i. e. a council of the whole world, or the whole earth, because it was called together from all parts of the Roman empire, to which the title of the world, or the earth, was given." It was summoned in 325, and was composed of 318 bishops. In this assembly the disputes between Alexander and Arius, on the subject of the Trinity, among other matters on which it was thought proper the council should legislate for the peace of the church, was to be adjusted by the exercise of *absolute power*. The historian reports, that "after many *keen* debates, and *violent* efforts of the two parties, the doctrine of Arius was condemned; Christ was declared consubstantial, or of the same essence, with the Father; the vanquished presbyter *banished* among the Illyrians; and his followers *compelled* to give their assent to the *creed or confession of faith*, which was composed by this council." Reader, behold the *origin* of creeds as instruments of ecclesiastical *power!* composed by the first *œcumenical council*, which was headed by an *Emperor*, the avowed champion of the *sign* of the *cross*, "whose authority no bishop presumed to call in question." See the ministers of Christ humbled at the footstool of an earthly prince, and *compelled to subscribe* "the exhibition of scriptural doctrines in regular

Digitized by Google

order," of whose *orthodoxy* his signature was the guarantee. If any reader will still advocate this mighty system of mischief and imposition, he may at least forbear with one who can even indignantly rebel. But it is no matter of wonder that the mind which can submit to all this should be easily alarmed by the cry of *heresy*. He who is so far degraded may be alarmed at any thing. It would require all the implements of inquisitorial misrule to support his courage, or *liberty* is a mere *word*.

But I must draw another parallel, inside of that which has just been completed. It is indispensably necessary, that the individual who wishes to be accurately informed on the general subject, should take another view of the whole matter, and look at the history of *theology*, as well as at that of *power*. If the reader is pleased so to do, he may follow me to the next chapter.

From the Christian Palladium.

Mr. Todd's Defence.

Brother Badger,

I HAVE just finished reading a volume of 245 pages, with the following title:—"*A Defence, containing the author's renunciation of Universalism, explained and enlarged: notices and aspersions of Universalist Editors answered and repelled: arguments and principles of Universalists examined and explored; and religion and revelation vindicated against scepticism and infidelity*—By LEWIS C. TODD." Published by O. Spafford, Erie, Pa.

It will be remembered that Mr. Todd was for many years a Universalist preacher, and by that people considered one of the best and ablest ministers they had in the state of New York. For two years he edited a Universalist periodical at Jamestown, Chatauque county, called the "*Genius of Liberty*." His moral character has always been reputed good, and his talents none disputed who have been familiar with his writings. His style, if not the most finished, is certainly most chaste, nervous, and convincing. He renounced Universalism in the spring of 1833, and published his renunciation in the last number of his periodical. That renunciation made no small stir. It is written with an air of candor and christian meekness, and with a strength of argument which defies successful assault. It was, however, assaulted, and its author was made to feel vollies of abuse from the Universalist *corps editorial*. Of that kind of commodity, Mr. Skinner of the Magazine and Advocate contributed with a liberal hand.

Attacked from so many quarters, and at the same time denied the privilege of replying in the papers that opened their vollies upon him, he has, it appears, been driven to the necessity of writing the volume now before me. His renunciation, with explanatory notes, constitutes the first chapter of the book. As all your readers may not have seen

Digitized by Google

Mr. Todd's renunciation, I will here give one extract, which, in my judgment, establishes a position in itself invulnerable:—

"In the first place, it is manifest that *hope* and *fear* are the two great sources of human volitions. *Hope* is powerful when balanced by *fear*, in inducing men to action. Men will never do much for an object because they *hope* for it, unless they *fear* that they shall not obtain it without action. Induce an avaricious man to believe that he will become rich whether he works or not, and he may ardently *hope* to be so; but such hope would never induce him to work. On the other hand, induce him to believe that if he works he shall become rich, and to fear that if he does not, he will be poor, and *hope* and *fear* together will make him active. So when we look impartially into the scriptures, we shall find the *hope* of reward and the *fear* of punishment every where held forth, as the proper inducements to a good life. These are inducements—they are parallel through the Bible—the one would have no practical effect without the other.

There is no reasonable question of the truth of the above positions. Induce a wicked man to believe he will finally obtain unperishable riches in heaven, whether he labors to lay them up or not, and idleness in divine things is the result. What benefit, then, is Universalism to the cause of God on earth?"

As a fair specimen of Mr. Todd's strength, I present the following. It is a successful refutation of that philosophy on which the doctrine of Universalism is mainly based; and may be properly termed their starting point:—

"We now state the grand argument, upon which the conclusion that all will be certainly saved, is entirely founded:—

"God is infinitely good, and of course must have designed in the beginning, and must still design the greatest possible good of his whole creation.

"The greatest possible good of his whole creation requires the universal salvation of all. But God is infinite in power, and, of course, *can* carry his design to promote the greatest possible good—the universal salvation of all, into full execution. As, therefore, God designs, in his infinite goodness, to save all men—and can, in his infinite power save all—all men *will* and *must* be saved."

"This argument, we say, is the great foundation of the whole system. To this the Bible is forced to yield whether or no! We admit the argument as plausible; but we deny that it is conclusive. It is all founded on *a priori* argument—reasoning from what *God is*, to what he *must do*. This is the wrong way to reason. Instead of this, we should reason *a posteriori*, from what God does do, to what he is, or may do.

The argument is confuted by well known facts, and of course is good for nothing. If the greatest possible good of the whole creation requires the final salvation of all men, it also requires their present salvation. The present happiness of all men is just as necessary to the greatest possible present good of all, as the future happiness of all men is to the greatest possible future good of all. If God *must* have

Digitized by Google

designed that all men should be happy in the future world, because he was infinitely good; by the same reasoning, he *must* have designed that all men should be happy in the present world. Yet we see all here are not happy. What certainty have we, then, in *reason*, that God's goodness and power will accomplish, and *must* accomplish hereafter, what he fails to do now?

"An angel before the creation learns that the world is to be made and peopled. He begins to calculate whether sin and misery would ever exist in the new world. He says, God is infinitely good, and therefore *must* design to prevent all sin and misery; and he is infinitely powerful, and therefore *can* prevent them, and therefore they must and will be prevented! The argument would have proved equally strong, that the divine attributes *must* have prevented the sin and misery now in the world, and that have been in it for some thousands of years; as it must prove now that those attributes *must* prevent the existence of sin and misery at any future time. But notwithstanding an angel before the creation might have proved that no sin and misery can ever exist under the government of God, by the very same argument that Universalists prove it cannot exist at a future period, yet he would have found in the event all his speculations on what infinite goodness and power *must* do, confounded in the absolute existence of sin and misery. What certainty have we that this same argument now used to disprove the future existence of sin and misery, is any better than it would have been, when used to disprove their present existence? If infinite goodness and power must necessarily prevent all misery at any future period, why must not the same infinite goodness and power prevent all present misery? If infinite goodness and power must not necessarily have prevented the present miseries of the world, there is no evidence that they must prevent the future. This difficulty completely upsets the very foundation of Universalism. It crumbles their favorite argument into nothing. They cannot get over it; neither can they twist round it, nor crawl under it."

Universalists are *predestinarians* of the most rigid stamp. They contend that "God must have foreordained all things and predestinated every sinful act from all eternity; and, therefore, it would be unjust and cruel to subject any to the loss of heaven for doing what God before determined they should do." On that subject Mr. Todd reasons in the following manner:—

"But Universalists hold that men are punished for their sins in this life. Is it not unjust and cruel to punish them in *this life*, for doing what God before determined they should do, as much as in the life to come? If it be just to punish them *here* for doing what they could not avoid, why not just to subject them hereafter to the loss of heaven for doing it? It will be replied that punishment here might be just, because it would be inflicted for the good of the punished; but the final loss of heaven could not be for the creature's good, and therefore would be unjust. This argument goes upon the ground that God foreordained the sin for the sinner's good, and then punishes him also

Digitized by Google

for his good. A man murders his neighbor! Well, God foreordained it for his good! Who should regret it, then? He is hanged! Well, God foreordained that for his good! The good Lord deliver us from such good as all this! Who may not sin, if every sin is foreordained for our good, and all the punishments too? What a good world predestinarian Universalists would make this to be! We might let loose every desire and passion—plunge into corruption and crime—defy both God and man; and all foreordained for our good! And if we got into prisons, or swung upon the gallows, it would all be for our good! If all this is for our good, we see not why we may not go to hell for our good! If any think all these things for their good, we see not why they may not call it a good thing—a most excellent thing, to be damned! If God has foreordained every thing for our good, why did he not foreordain perfect holiness and happiness for our good, instead of sin and misery?"

On the ultimate object of Universalist labors, and the fruits of their doctrine, Mr. Todd makes some pointed statements. They have the air of severity; and yet, from close observation for years, the writer of this believes them substantially correct. He says—

"So far as reason is to guide us on the question of Universalism, its best evidence would be that it tended in its practical operations to reform the profligate, the abandoned, and the impious. Had the doctrine this recommendation, it would be the best argument Reason could urge in its favor. But alas for the cause! We have said in our renunciation that it has no such advantage. Editors and preachers of the doctrine say that it has in an eminent degree. We leave the disputed point with the public. We see by their papers that the work of proselyting to their faith is advancing: societies and believers are multiplied; but we ask, where is the single drunkard reformed—a single loose, impious wretch reclaimed, and converted to piety and virtue by the doctrine? Yes, we ask, *Where?* and Echo answers, *Where?* It is not because such men are prejudiced against the doctrine, or its preachers, and will not hear them—not because they will not hear it; but because the vicious will not reform until the fear of hell settles down upon the trembling soul, and alarms the guilty conscience. Then the pale votary of vice shrinks from his bold career, and humbles himself in penitence before God. The author of this work once preached Universalism in Ripley, Chatauque county, New York, where he found among his hearers a Universalist drunkard—he had been a preacher. But he was a constant attendant on my preaching. He extolled it—he praised the glorious sentiment till we preached directly against drunkenness. We have never seen him since. He liked the doctrine; but to hear a Universalist preacher condemn drunkenness so pointedly, was more than he could bear. So it is with the wicked generally: they love the doctrine and love their sins both at once. How often do we hear men and boys talking of "the unbounded love of God," with a profane oath in almost every sentence! The most abandoned swearers, and most abominable characters through the states, are frequently found advocating, amidst shocking oaths and drunken revelry, the "liberal sentiment!"

* * * * The author saw these things till his heart sickened. He was reading many Universalist periodicals; and became fully satisfied, from the drift and general course of them, that their secret object appeared to be, and their actual effect was, to raise doubts in the minds of their readers, on one religious subject after another, till they should believe in none; and by innuendoes and sarcastic reflections upon the errors of christians, to spread abroad a deep and universal prejudice against a gospel ministry, the Bible, and all religion. He became satisfied, beyond a single doubt, that all this was true. He conversed also with many professors of Universalism at different times, and found most all of them to view the subject in the same light—most all of them to be enemies to christianity, and to consider the whole engine of Universalism now in the United States, to be a shrewd and well concerted scheme to bring together the elements and efforts of unbelief, to overthrow in the end the christian religion. His candid opinion is, and has long been, that ninety-nine out of a hundred, who profess publicly to be Universalists, are unbelievers in divine revelation. I say this in the fear of God, as the result of all that I know of them. And I know, too, that they themselves, when they read this, will know that it is not far from the truth, however unwilling they may be to own it. * * * Then the question, Which side shall I take? There is to be no middle way. We must either stand for Christ or infidelity. I looked forward—shall religion be banished from the Union? Shall the black banner of scepticism be unfurled—universal pollution and crime crimson our happy plains—and the horrors of despair freeze up all the tender germs of philanthropy, and extinguish the last vestige of faith, tenderness, virtue, and hope? I looked upon my children; and nature herself, in her own holy eloquence, pleaded for religion, and admonished me to be a christian, and come out from the ranks which appeared to be tending to infidelity." DELTA.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

B. Clark to Elder A. Campbell, on Regeneration.

Dear Sir,

I HAVE been much pleased in following your pen on many subjects, while at the same time I have thought you to be mistaken on the subject of *regeneration*. I purpose not to speak against *immersion* in material *water*. But wish you and your friends to examine the subject more particularly, and compare the scriptures with the ground you have taken, lest peradventure you *may be* deceived, and consequently deceiving others. In your "Millennial Harbinger—Extra, No. 6," for August, 1834, on page 413, we have the following "*induction into thekingdom of heaven.*"—

"In naturalizing aliens, the commandment of the King is, first to submit to them the constitution, or preach to them *the gospel of the*

Digitized by Google

kingdom. Soon as they understand and believe this, and are desirous of being translated into the kingdom of Christ and of God, that 'they may receive the remission of sins and inheritance among all that are sanctified,' they are to be buried in water, into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and raised out of it confessing their death to sin, their faith in Christ's sacrifice and resurrection; and thus they are born of water and Spirit, and constituted citizens of the kingdom of heaven. *To as many as thus receive him, he gives privilege to become the children of God;* for they are *'born of God'*—born of God, when born of water and of the Spirit, because this is the institution of God."——"In those days of apostacy some imagine that they can be born of the Spirit without water, and that the King is as well pleased with them who have been born without a mother, as with those who are lawfully born of father and mother!"

Dear sir, I shall not review the above extract *at this time*, until I come to the words, "*And* THUS *they are born of water and the Spirit*, and constituted citizens of the kingdom of heaven." From these words, and to the end of the extract, I understand you to say (as your "brethren of the reformation do also) that the words of Christ in John iii. 5. means immersion in *material water*, where he speaks of being "born of *water* and of the *Spirit*."

1st. That you hold, and preach, that, in "regeneration," the *Spirit is "father,"* and the river, or *material water*, is *"mother!"*

2d. That those who are buried in material *water*, and raised out of it in obedience to the command to be baptized, are, in a gospel view, "THUS *born* of *water* and the *Spirit*."

3d. That as many as are "thus born" of *material water* and the *Spirit of God*, are "lawfully *born of God*," and that any person who has not been immersed in material *water*, has not been "lawfully" born of God; consequently, "cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii. 5.)

I believe I have correctly stated your views; but if not, please to correct me. It appears to me that you dwell more emphatically on water baptism than the Apostle Paul did, who said, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." Indeed, you should dwell upon it more and more, if this be regeneration. But as I must be brief, I will notice the three particular points of your doctrine which I have noticed above.

First. That material water *is not* our *"mother"* in regeneration, is plain from the following reasons:—1st. Because it is not so called in scripture. 2d. Because that "Zion," the "church," the New Jerusalem, the city of the living God (and shall we say) the bride, the Lamb's wife, is our mother in regeneration. See Gal. iv. 26. "But Jerusalem which is above is free, *which is the mother of us all.*" Psalm lxxxvii. 5. "And of Zion it shall be said, "This and that man was born in her; and the Highest himself shall establish her." Isai. lxvi. 8. "For as soon as Zion travailed she brought forth her children." See verses 9, 10, &c. Thus, dear sir, you are mistaken if you suppose the element *water* to be our "mother" in regeneration.

Digitized by Google

Second. That our Saviour has *no allusion* in John iii. 5. to immersion in *material water*, when he speaks of being "born of *water* and of the *Spirit*." This I infer, 1st. from what he said, that "except a man be born of *water* and of the *Spirit*, he *cannot* enter into the kingdom of God."—But said again to the malefactor, or to the thief who was converted while on the cross (without any chance of immersion) "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." And thus you make a direct contradiction in the words of our Saviour, by your explanation of the subject? But we must admit that this man, and a thousand others, although never immersed in material water, yet have been "born of water and of the Spirit," according to the true intent and meaning of Christ's words. 2d. Do the scriptures always mean *material water* when that word is used? No! "With joy shall you draw *water* out of the wells of salvation." "I will *water* it every moment." "I will pour *water* on him that is thirsty." "Then will I sprinkle clean *water* upon you," &c. "And I will put my *Spirit* within you." "But whosoever drinketh of the *water* that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the *water* that I shall give him shall be in him a well of *water* springing up into everlasting life." John iv. 14. "Flow rivers of living *water*." "Lead them to living fountains of *water*." "Take of the *water* of life freely." "Living *waters* shall go out from Jerusalem." "And he showed me a pure river of *water* of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb." Thus we may see, that for a person to be born of God—born with an endless life—it would be necessary that he should be born of *living water of life*, such *water* as Christ said he would give (John iv. 14.) and not with "*corruptible*," or material *water*, as you say!

3d. Again, the *doctrine*, i. e. the *words* of Christ, are of the same import; the same as if he had said, 'Except a man be born of the *word* and *Spirit*,' &c. James i. 18. "Of his own will begot he us *with the word of truth*." This is the "*engrafted word*," which is able to save the soul. 1 Pet. i. 23. "Being born again, *not of corruptible* seed, but of *incorruptible*, by *the word of God*, which liveth and abideth forever." This being born of *water*, in the language of Christ, is no more nor less than the cleansing and purifying nature of the everlasting gospel of truth, *the word of life*. Eph. v. 23. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and *cleanse it*, with the *washing of water by the word*." Here the *word* is compared to *water*, because that all the words of Christ are spirit and life, and are of a purifying nature.

Third. You seem to think (if I can understand you) that any person who is not immersed in material water, is not *lawfully* "born of God," no more than a person could be "lawfully born without a mother"! I think I cannot misunderstand you. This reminds me of what one of your friends (a man of respectable talents) said to me a few days ago. When conversing with him on this subject, I observed to him that, according to this theory, no Friend or Quaker, or any other person (who had not been immersed in material water) could ever enter

Digitized by Google

into the kingdom of God? "*No!*" said he, "*not one* of them, according to the plan of the gospel!" Thus we behold a theory, not only tending to self-righteousness—to a confidence in a *mere act* of the creature for salvation; but also a theory calculated to destroy christian union and charity among the children of God. This, sir, is a very serious matter, and none of us will be the loser by properly understanding—yea, by searching and seeking to know the true nature of regeneration. "*That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit.*"

But how shall we know and understand the nature of regeneration? If a "master of Israel knew not;" and if, without this new birth, we cannot enter heaven, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the *words of eternal life.*" See Ezek. xxxvi. 25, &c. "Then will I sprinkle *clean water* upon you, and ye shall be clean, from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a *new spirit* will I put *within* you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my *Spirit* within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes." Mark, this "*clean water*" must mean "*living water,*" the "*water of life.*" This must be the work of an almighty hand. Why should we not understand our Saviour to mean the same kind of *water* in John iii. 5. as in John iv. 14.? "But whosoever drinketh of the *water* that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be *in him* a well of water springing up into everlasting life." "*Sir, give me this water,*" said the woman of Samaria. We must *ask* for this *water of life* and for the Holy *Spirit* that quickeneth. See again John vii. 37, 38. In the great and last day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, *as the scriptures have said,* out of his belly shall flow rivers of *living water.* (*This spake he of the Spirit,* which they that *believe* on him should receive." Here the beloved disciple tells us that our Lord, in speaking of this "*living water,*" means the Holy *Spirit.* What can be plainer than this?

Now the natural man is in sin and in death; and, like a wild olive tree, bearing unpleasant fruit—not subject to the law of God—not bearing any of the heavenly fruits of the Spirit, but bearing all manner of corrupt fruit—under the dominion of darkness! But God so loved the world, while in this lost state, that he sent his beloved Son to rescue man from under the dominion of darkness. And in order that man may be restored to the divine image of God, and be prepared to enjoy that kingdom which is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit, he "must be born again"—must be translated out of the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of light—must be renewed in the *inner man*—must be made a new creature in Christ Jesus: consequently must "*repent*" with a godly sorrow for every thought, word, and deed contrary to holiness; and "*believe*" in the Lord Jesus Christ, with a living *faith* which *works* by love and *purifies* the heart and affections. Hence the command, "*Wash you,*

Digitized by Google

make you clean, put away the evil of your doings, cease to do evil, learn to do well." The whole man must be renewed after the image of him who creates the soul anew—the whole soul, life, and affections must be changed—the "engrafted word" of life must be received with meekness. (He that soweth the *good seed* is the Son of Man.) This spiritual seed of life must be nourished and cherished until the whole soul, mind, and affections are overwhelmed in the love of God and holiness—until the whole soul is immersed "*into*" (as you say) the very "name" and "nature" of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Then the soul is fit for heaven. When Peter began to speak to the household of Cornelius, the Holy Spirit fell on all them which heard the word. Peter said, (when speaking of this,) "*Then remembered I* the word of the Lord, how that he said," (see Acts i. 5.) "John, indeed, baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit." Acts xi. 16. Peter knew that these were baptized with the Holy Spirit, consequently were "born of *water* and of the *Spirit*" *before* he commanded them to be baptized with material water. And "every one that doeth righteousness is born of him," "and every one that loveth is born of God."

But lest I tire your patience, I will close this by asking you, 1st. Whether it has not been clearly shown in this communication that we have *no right* to pretend that material water is our "mother" in regeneration, or in inducting into the kingdom of heaven? 2d. Whether it has not been clearly shown that we have *no right* when people are baptized in material water, to say, that "*thus* they are born of water and the Spirit, and constituted citizens of the kingdom of heaven"? 3d. Whether it has not been clearly shown that the text (John iii. 5.) has no allusion to material water? 4th. Whether it has not been shown that to be "born of God," i. e. "born of *water* and of the *Spirit*," must be of "living *water* of life"—such water as Christ said, "I will give"? 5th. Whether there is not *danger* in thus confounding the Spirit of God with corruptible or material things? 6th. Whether it does not contradict the words of Christ to say, that to "be buried in water and raised out of it," is "*thus*" being born of water and the Spirit, when himself declares that this operation cannot be seen any more than the wind that bloweth?

M. Winans to Elder Henry Grew.

James Town, *Ohio*, April 25, 1835.

Beloved brother Grew,

YOUR admonition of the 6th instant, published in the current volume of the "Harbinger," has been read, and its contents carefully examined. I may have been a little too fast, or too severe, in my essay on the subject of "*faith alone.*" There may be some exceptions to the general rule. Some who advocate that notion may practise and teach acts of obedience; but surely they would leave

Digitized by Google

out the word "*alone*" after "*faith*," if they considered those acts of obedience necessary to forgiveness of sins. The Apostles have not added the word "alone." And if it were added to other expressions, as it has been to "faith," we should have *abstraction* in all its sublimity. Thus, "eight souls were effectually saved by water,"—If the word "*alone*" were added to "*souls*," we should have it about as the "*faith alone men*" fix things; there is nothing said in the passage about *bodies*, and there is as strong grounds to contend for the salvation of *naked souls* from this passage, as there is to contend for salvation by *naked faith*, because the adjuncts are not mentioned.

Your figure of the "wife case," relative to repentance, I conclude is not in point, that being a case of personal violence—the other, a transgression of law. If we were to speak of repentance for violence done to "the wife," without a knowledge of *her* or of the *act of violence*, it would then be coming towards the point. For repentance for sin, or transgression of law, without a knowledge of the lawgiver or law, or rather without *belief* in the lawgiver or the law, is what I conceive to be contended for by such as place *repentance* before *faith*.

I cannot help coming to a different conclusion from the reasoning adduced by you to that to which you come. You reason thus:—"Indeed, it is impossible for a man to accept *forgiveness* while he is insensible that he has offended." Faith in the *lawgiver* (Christ) and in the *law* transgressed, must necessarily precede repentance and application for *forgiveness*. For how can application be made to him of whom we have never heard? and how can we ask forgiveness without the knowledge of transgression? and how can we obtain the knowledge of transgression without the knowledge of law? Therefore, *faith* must necessarily *precede* both *repentance* and *forgiveness*. This is the conclusion to which your reasoning brings me.

But I wish to say a few things relative to the famous case of Abraham. Every *faith alone* man, without exception, adduces this case to prove "*remission of sins by faith alone*;" whereas they can prove no such thing from the case. They suppose the term "*justification*" when used in reference to Abraham, means *the forgiveness of sins*. If it have any such meaning when applied to the old Patriarch, I have mistaken his character entirely. Let us now carefully review the case.

Paul says, Heb. vi. "By *faith* Abraham when called to go out into a place which he should afterwards receive as an inheritance, *obeyed*, and went out, not knowing whither he was going." Here Paul plainly declares that Abraham was a man of *faith* and of *obedience* too, before God made the promise of a numerous seed to him, *the belief of which promise* was counted to him for righteousness. And Moses says, Gen. xiv. that before God made the promise to Abraham of the numerous seed as the stars of heaven, "that Melchizedek the Priest of the Most High God blessed him." Who would infer from the history of this case, that Abraham was an ungodly sinner, an unpardoned wretch, at the time God made the promise to him. It is calumny to speak thus of the Patriarch; but in this case there was a

Digitized by Google

direct promise of a numerous seed, without any condition on the part of Abraham: "And he said to Abraham, Look now towards heaven, and count the stars if you can number them. And he said unto him, *So shall thy seed be.*" Abraham could do nothing more in this case than believe; for without a command, there can be no obedience.

Now for the next case, in which Abraham is said to have been *justified.* Some 26 years after the first promise and justification by the belief of God's promise, Abraham was commanded to offer Isaac in sacrifice, in whom the first promise rested. He did it, still believing the first promise relative to the numerous seed. Herein he gave proof of his faith, and perfected it. But who would infer from the history of this case, that Abraham received the *pardon of his sins* when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? No such conclusion can be deduced from the history of the case. For neither Moses, Paul, nor James, ever intimates that Abraham had at any time transgressed any command or law of God; and to infer the forgiveness of sins without transgressions of law, is to infer the destruction of that which never existed. Therefore all the arguments for the *forgiveness of sins*, built upon the case of Abraham, are like superstructures built in the air—they have neither foundation nor props. The term *justification*, when applied to Abraham, can mean nothing more nor less than the approbation or approval of God, and may be applied in the same sense to the saints of the Most High God, as often as they believe God's promises, or do what he commands.

If the forgiveness of sins can be shown to depend upon an unconditional promise of God, like to the promise of a numerous seed made to Abraham, then, and not till then, can *"faith alone"* men sustain their position; but when that is done, *universalism* will also be established.

I will now say a few things relative to *"charity,"* the meaning of which is perhaps as much perverted in this our day, as any other expression used by Jesus or his Apostles. It has now assumed the meaning of *courtesy*, or rather *sycophancy.* He that says to all the sects in christendom, 'Go on and prosper; you will all reach heaven at last, if you are honest and hold out faithful to the end,' is counted *the charitable man* in this our day. If *ignorance* or *error* will save men, then he may be said to be charitable; but if a strong desire for men's salvation be true charity, and nothing but the belief of truth and the obedience of God will save men, then he is the most uncharitable of men; for when he finds men in ignorance and error, and living in disobedience to God, he tells them to persevere in the road to destruction. If this be charity, then may *bitter* and *sweet* be said to mean the same thing.

But I agree with you, that all the soldiers of Jesus Christ ought to be *courteous* towards all men, and *especially the aged.* If at any time I err in this, I thank the friend or brother who apprises me of it, and consider it a pleasure, rather than a pain, to ask forgiveness for my rudeness. If, then, in my former essay, I have thus transgressed, I now ask the forgiveness of the brother addressed, as well as of all others

Digitized by Google

who have read my rude remarks. O that God may forgive all our blunders in trying to advocate his cause upon the earth!

Yours in the christian hope,

M. WINANS.

In the absence of the Editor, we feel induced, by the above communication, to express a feeling of deep regret, that a reformation, which we humbly suggested, and respectfully submitted to the consideration of the friends and lovers of truth and peace throughout all the churches, more than twenty-five years ago, for the express purpose of putting an end to religious controversy among christians, should appear to take the unhappy turn, to which, with painful anxiety, we have seen it verging for the last ten years; namely, to "verbal contentions, from which come envy, strife, evil speakings, unjust suspicions, perverse disputings,—rather than godly edification which is in faith;"—from all which we are divinely admonished to abstain; and "not to fight about words for no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers:—For the servant of the Lord must not be contentious, but gentle towards all men, fit to teach, patiently bearing evil, with meekness instructing those that set themselves in opposition; if, by any means, God may be pleased to grant them reformation, to the acknowledgment of truth." Wherefore, as an alternative for the unhappy contentions and desolating divisions, so inimical to genuine christianity, with which the church had been vexed and torn to pieces for upwards of fifteen centuries, we adventured, as above stated, to adopt for ourselves, and to recommend to our divided brethren, "the rejection of all human opinions and inventions of men, as of any authority, or as having any place in the church of God, that so we might for ever cease from farther contentions about such things;—that, returning to, and holding fast by, the original standard, we should take the *divine word alone* for our rule,—the *Holy Spirit* for our teacher and guide to lead us in all divine truth,—and *Christ alone*, as exhibited in the word, for our salvation; that, by so doing, we might be in peace among ourselves, follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. And that, for this blissful purpose, we would countenance and support such ministers, and such only, as exhibit a manifest conformity to the original standard of christianity in conversation and doctrine, in zeal and diligence;—only such as reduce to practice the simple original form of christianity expressly exhibited upon the sacred page, without attempting to inculcate any thing of human authority, of private opinion, or inventions of men, as having any place in the constitution, faith, or worship of the christian church,—or any thing as matter of christian faith or duty, for which there cannot be expressly produced a "*thus saith the Lord*," either in express terms, or by approved scripture precedent." [See Declaration and Address of the Christian Association of Washington, Pa. published 1809, pp. 3, 4. Having thus advised and resolved, we proceeded, in our subsequent address, earnestly to urge the adoption of the above resolutions, as the only just, relevant, and practicable ground of religious unity, instead of the impossible unity of opinion;—endeavoring to evince, beyond the possibility of rational objection, the abundant and alone sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment, to answer every purpose of our holy religion for the conversion and salvation of the world. In the execution of this design, we are happy to say, we so far succeeded as to obviate any attempt, on the part of our reluctant and uncompromising brethren, to exhibit a formal refutation of our overture, or of the truth and relevancy of the arguments adduced to sustain and enforce it. And had the advocates of the proposed reformation continued to sustain and enforce it, as in the document referred to, we are constrained to believe, that the sectarian popular objections which have been brought against it, and with which its progress has been unhappily embarrassed, could never have been advanced by any, who acknowledge the all-sufficiency, and alone sufficiency, of the belief and obedience of the Holy Scriptures, in their obvious

Digitized by Google

grammatic sense, for the salvation of sinners; for the perfect edification of the christian church, independent of all human opinions and inventions of men. And here let it be noted, that we make no larger demand in behalf of the Holy Scriptures, than they expressly and explicitly claim; see Psalm xix. 7, 11, and 2 Tim. iii. 14—17, with many other places to the same purpose. So that to deny our assumption of the alleged sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, is to file off into the ranks of open and avowed infidelity.

We did not then, however, flatter ourselves, nor do we yet, that the just, adequate, and unexceptionable ground of religious unity which we assumed, and proposed to our contending brethren, would have entirely exempted us from the toils of controversy; but only that it would have been of a very different and more profitable kind. For instead of detecting and exposing the supposed errors of any of the *existing isms* of sectarian christendom, our controversies should have been confined to *verbal criticisms* about the literal, contextural, or analogical meaning of the sacred text; or about the truth and justness of its translation; all of which would have a direct and proper tendency to make us better acquainted with the true, literal, and figurative meaning of the language of the sacred volume. While, in the mean time, according to our assumption, it would still be fairly demonstrable to all concerned, that, however they might grammatically differ about the correct literal meaning of a particular word or phrase, there still remained an abundant sufficiency of clear and explicit declaration, about the meaning of which there could be no doubt, without confounding all verbal certainty, the belief and obedience of which would, and must be, amply sufficient to perfect christian character; unless it be assumed, that no person can be a true and approved christian, without possessing a correct literal knowledge of the true grammatical meaning of the sacred oracles; —a position which, we presume, none will pretend to sustain. But, alas! how have we wandered from our divine premises! We have forsaken terra firma, and are again out at sea, amidst the rocks and vortices, that have absorbed every adventurer from Arius to the present day. And, indeed, if we are to calculate the future by the past, especially for the last ten years, we might live to see an exhibition of all the curious questions and perplexing controversies of the last fifteen centuries, upon the face of the periodicals professedly in favor of the proposed reformation. Thus, instead of a genuine scriptural reformation, reducing and restoring our holy religion to its original heaven-born purity, in the belief and practice of a divine declaration, expressly legible upon the face of the sacred page;—we should have a reiteration, a renewed exhibition, of metaphysical abstractions, of theological polemics, notions and opinions, to which Buck's Theological Dictionary might again serve as a portable index. *Ainsi ne soit il!* T. C.

Clerical Skirmishing.

ALTHOUGH Mr. Campbell has so often proposed to the orthodox belligerents to meet him in open combat; yet through fear of being driven from their tottering ramparts, they have refused coming into the open field, and prefer skirmishing about their walled cities; and lest the veterans from their own army should join the reformation party, under the rules and regulations of the *ancient gospel*, they are waging war against the *reformers*, without carrying it beyond their own frontiers: unwilling, too, to permit their soldiers to hear the terms stipulated by the ancient gospel, they are teaching things that are contrary to the principles of the proposed reformation, and charging them upon the reformers, without giving them an opportunity to plead their own cause. An instance to this effect may be found in

Digitized by Google

the 4th number of the "Western Christian Advocate," under the head of *Campbellism, No.* 1. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink."—*Paul.* "Ours is a fluctuating world; its fashions pass away; and the opinions of communities and of men so frequently change, that old things sometimes become new. We live in an age when some of the errors of antiquity have been revived and remodeled, and forced upon the world under the imposing name of "the ancient gospel," but more commonly and appropriately called "Campbellism," after Mr. Campbell, their chief propagator; and as this *ism*, which is in reality "*another gospel*," has made the West its principal theatre, where, though maimed and crippled, it is still struggling for existence, some notice of it may not, perhaps, be labor in vain. The present is, therefore, designed as the *first* of a few essays upon this subject." &c. &c. &c.

Thus writes William Phillips, of Newport, Ky. well knowing who will read it; and, notwithstanding the many misrepresentations and misquotations given by Mr. Phillips, he well knows that few, if any of his readers, will examine the subject for themselves; that the greatest and most palpable errors may be set forth against the principles of the reformation; and that no one will be permitted, through the same medium, to correct them: but, however we may lament and abhor such iniquitous proceedings, no strange thing has befallen us, for this has been the plan adopted by the priesthood in all ages, (since the commencement of the grand apostacy,) to keep the light of the gospel *Sun* from illuminating the understandings of the people; lest they should throw off the "yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear."

Hear Mr. Phillips again:—"But who would have dreamed that a Protestant *reformer*, in the nineteenth century, claiming exemption alike from "Catholicism" and "Sectarianism," would have taken up *water regeneration** from the dregs of papal rubbish, and make it a leading feature of his reformation? This Mr. Campbell has done."

Now, as it is the intention of Mr. Philips to continue his series against the reformation, unless, as a spider, he should be caught in his own web, I hope some one more adequate to the task than myself, will show to at least a part of the readers of the Western Christian Advocate, the absurdity of his views. R. O. W.

Hillsborough, Illinois.

The Lord's Supper.

Dear brother Campbell,

IT seems from what has transpired within these few years, that the time at which the Lord's supper should be celebrated, but particularly the frequency of its celebration, is considered a fair

* I suppose Mr. Philips has never read Mr. Wesley's treatise on baptism, as quoted by me in the December number of the 5th volume of the Millennial Harbinger.

Digitized by Google

subject of discussion; and so far as I am informed, it has been treated hitherto rather as a matter of opinion—and if so, it must unquestionably be a matter of forbearance between those who think and practise differently in reference to this matter. Those who celebrate it only once or twice, &c. in the year, justify themselves under the plea, "that there is no express command when or how often it should be observed." These same persons would be horror-struck, should a professed christian even intimate a doubt as to the obligation of christians to observe the first day of the week as a day of rest from worldly labor and business. The duty of observing this day is, with but few exceptions, so far as I know, admitted—yea, insisted upon by all christians. But I must say, it is with this day, as it is with the Lord's supper—no express command for its observance—nay, I mistake, there is express command for the observance of the Lord's supper, and in so far it has superior claims upon our observance over the first day of the week, and stands upon the *same footing* as to the frequency with which it should be celebrated. But daily experience convinces me more and more, that an amazingly large majority of professed christians feel no obligation to observe the first day of the week, growing out of the New Testament; and that in reference to it they are Jews;—licentious indeed, for they undertake to alter the fourth command, and remember not the seventh day, but the first. I think, dear brother, there is a need be that this matter be brought again and again before the minds of christians, and that their minds be roused up to consider the grounds of their obligation to observe this day; and then, perhaps, they may feel more concern in inquiring into the manner of its observance. Custom is a tyrant, who often keeps those bound, who have openly and professedly revolted from his sway. How he opposes reformation! I wanted to say a few words to you about another matter, and as this subject from existing circumstances was upon my mind, I thought I would say a few words to you on it in the same letter; and thus, perhaps, elicit something from your pen which might be of general utility.

Yours as ever, C. W. TALIAFERRO.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

"CHRISTIAN BAPTIST" & "CHRISTIANITY RESTORED."

THESE are two works, the circulation of which every influential friend and advocate of the ancient gospel and order of things should exert himself to extend far and wide, and among every class of readers. They should be in the possession of *every* disciple who is able to procure them; and there are but few who could not, by a little more than ordinary exertion, and by some pecuniary savings of expenditure for vain, idle, trifling things, the toys and luxuries of this world. They who are in possession of more than competence—of affluence and wealth—would do much to promote the cause of

Digitized by Google

true religion, by donating these works—the last one particularly, to those who are unable or indisposed to procure them. These two works, with the Living Oracles, would form a good religious library in themselves; and they contain much of the accumulated wisdom of ages and nations, arranged, digested, and compiled by their editor and author. The *Christian Baptist* contains as much, and perhaps more, of the true principles of reasoning and philosophy, than any book in any language; and exhibits the true subserviency of human knowledge to divine, in reference to which alone it is valuable or useful. May these works be instrumental in doing much and great good in the promotion and extension of true religion over the nations of the world!

J. R. H.

OPERATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

DOES not the doctrine of the mystical, physical, naked operation of the Holy Spirit upon the sinner, without any medium or means, by superseding the necessity of testimony or revelation, lead to deism? If the Holy Spirit operates in this way, where is the use or necessity of that knowledge and revelation which the christian receives as the truth, and the infidel rejects as false? And where was the use of miracles to convince the world when they were first wrought, and where is the use of the *record* of these miracles to convince the world since, and now;—if the sinner be convinced without the means of that testimony or record, and made a christian? Calvinists, or many of them, and perhaps Arminians, contend, I believe, that the sinner *cannot understand* that testimony without a previous operation of the Spirit to enable him to do it, and to have faith in it!

H.

Progress of Reform.

RHINEBECK, N. Y. February 24, 1835.

I THINK you are apprised that there are a few disciples in this place who have laid aside their own fancied knowledge and that of others, frail and erring like themselves, and have commenced a scholarship under the Great Teacher, commissioned of the Father to reveal his will.

There has been a small church here for the space of fifteen years, known by the name of General Baptists, whose tenets I have no doubt you are acquainted with, under the superintendance of our much loved father. Somewhere about seven years since he met with your debate with M'Calla, and from that time has fully maintained the ground you there assumed. It is now about four years since we began to commemorate the Lord's death as often as his resurrection. There are about 30 attached to the church. We have a young man among us from New York, proclaiming the word. Part of his time is spent here, and part on the other side of the river, among a few brethren there, who have broken the shackles and bonds of sectarianism, and have come forth asserting that liberty wherewith Christ has made them free, by keeping his commandments.

We have much need of assistance, and if you or any of the brethren engaged in proclaiming the word of life, would visit us, it might be the cause of exciting an interest in these things, and much good might result therefrom; I need not assure you that it would afford us the most heartfelt pleasure.

I remain yours, MARY HUGHES.

Digitized by Google

SALEM, Washington county, Ind. February 24, 1835.

Brother Campbell,

THERE are a few of us in this place, professing to be reformers after the apostolic mould, as expressly exhibited in the New Testament; but I fear we scarcely deserve the name, for we have not yet attained to one of the first things mentioned in the practice of the primitive disciples; viz. a steadfast continuance in the breaking of the loaf. You will see by this, that we have not made as yet a great proficiency. We belong to a small congregation of between 30 and 40 members; some of them excluded persons from the Regular Baptists, for the enormous crime of taking the New Testament alone, for their only rule of christian faith and practice; some of them from other orthodox sects, so called; but the majority is of newly immersed persons. We have built a convenient little meeting-house, three miles east from Salem, where we have preaching once or twice a month. We sometimes have a discourse in Salem by travelling brethren, in the court-house, as they happen to pass through. O that we had a well informed, zealous, persevering proclaimer of the ancient gospel in this place, were it but for a year or two. I do think that much good might be done at this very time by such a person. I conclude with repeating again my former query, so often proposed—Can you, or will you, ever come to Salem, Indiana?

May the Lord bless your efforts to restore the ancient gospel, is the earnest prayer of yours, in the hope of immortality.

MOSES MARTIN.

☞Having just arrived at home, after an absence of 75 days, we cannot now peruse any of the letters on hand for news. We found the preceding part of this number printed off on our arrival, and will only add to the progress of reform a fact or two reported at this office. A German Lutheran Minister, in Maryland, and a Methodist Circuit Preacher, in Ohio, have recently been immersed into the faith formerly delivered to the saints, and have been cordially received by the brethren. Brother *Burnet*, on a tour of two weeks, to Maysville, not long since, immersed 23 persons. Brother *O. Kane*, whom we saw a few days since, has been very successfully proclaiming the word in Mason and Bracken counties, Ky.; and in general the prospects are flattering, if the laborers in the field will, with all prudence, gravity, and simplicity, preach Christ, and no theory concerning Christ. But to convert men from one theory to another will be of little account, unless they are converted to the Lord.

EDITOR.

Sketch of a Tour of 75 Days.

FROM Bethany, in company with my daughter *Lavinia*, I set out for Nashville, Tennessee, on the morning of the 25th of February. Embarked that same evening at Wheeling, on board the steam-boat *Reindeer*, destined for that port. Suddenly, and rather unexpectedly, even in this variable climate, the wind shifted from south-east to north-west; and, as usual in that season, wafted from the Boreal regions the wintry clouds, which, only a few days before, with reluctance began their retreat at the orders of the South-East. The Ohio, not yet freed from the mountain ice, soon chilled again, and began to

Digitized by Google

cover herself from shore to shore with new accumulations. We urged our way during the day in the midst of a war of elements, and lay upon our oars at night; but, so serious was the conflict, that the water wheels and rudder, severely crippled by the bold advances of the floating islands, finally gave way to the unequal struggle, and for a time we were led captive by the enemy. Almost within sight of Cincinnati, we were likely to be dashed upon the shore by the insolence of the ice, which, during its triumph, showed us no favors. But our brave Captain, aided by his skillful Pilot, recovered the helm from the triumphant enemy, and made good his landing immediately above the city; and, finding an opening in the ranks of the enemy, very artfully descended into port before the sun retreated beyond the Rocky Mountains.

It being the evening of the first day of the week, after supper I made my way to Sycamore street, and found the church assembled together with some citizens, and had the pleasure, though unknown to them, of uniting with them in social worship, and of hearing our beloved brother *Burnet* address the audience on the principles of the doctrine of Christ. After the discourse was ended, we had the pleasing exchange of christian salutations, and returned to the Reindeer, refreshed in spirit by the good things of the kingdom.

Next morning, on examining the wounds and bruises inflicted on our vessel by the belligerent forces, it was thought prudent to place her under the care of the Doctors; and thus we were compelled to embark on board the *Ben Franklin* for Louisville. This well and strong built boat, distinguished for the energy and rigid *economy* of the great political economist whose memory she honors, even to the details of table comforts, forced her passage, in less than 24 hours, through one hundred and fifty miles of floating ice. She, indeed, did not wholly escape injury; and, plying only between the ports of the two great rival cities of the Ohio, we had to seek another boat at Louisville, and fortunately found the *Ohioan* proposing to sail for Nashville that same day. But, with regret be it spoken, the promises of sea Captains and steam boat Captains are not more to be depended on than the winds; and, therefore, we did not sail till Wednesday morning—and my appointment was for Nashville the next Lord's day. And still more unpropitious, we found the canal round the Falls of Ohio fast locked up with ice, beyond the power of our steam engine to subdue. After bearing upon it with all our force, time after time, we were finally compelled to retreat, and give the precedence to a heavier vessel, with a more powerful engine, which opened the way for us. In six hours we sailed three miles, and a little before sun-set entered the Ohio again.

We had promised ourselves an open river below the Falls; but in this we were again disappointed; for neither the rocks in the bottom of the Ohio, which break its waves, nor the artificial degrees of latitude which designate the relative position of places on its shore, can throw an insuperable barrier in the way of a fierce and angry north-wester. Hence it was not till we saw the mouth of the beauti-

Digitized by Google

ful, modest, and pacific Cumberland, that we saw a clear and unobstructed navigation, inviting us to turn our face to the south. But it was sailing up stream; and this, under the best circumstances, is always more difficult than to descend; and, therefore, we found 200 miles ascent enough for two days.

On board were found men of no religion, as well as persons of different religious creeds; and among these we occasionally found one disposed to converse on the outworks of systematic theology. Among these we found a very sociable, agreeable, and intelligent companion in the person of Mr. *Avery*, of Pittsburg, an elder in the Methodist community, and well reported of for his good works in the cause of radical reformation among his brethren. His eyes were opened to discern both good and evil among the Wesleyan brotherhood; and he has had the courage to oppose the rapid strides of the Methodistic priesthood in their bold aspirations after a concentrated religious despotism in the person of their bishops; but seems not fully aware that the basement story, as well as the garret of the Methodistic temple, needs a thorough cleansing, if not a new-modelling, even down to the corner stone of its discipline, which leans 23½ degrees more to Babylon than to Jerusalem.

At the invitation of the passengers and Captain, I consented to address the audience on Lord's day, at the usual hour, on the subject of man's relations to the future and eternal world. We were heard with attention for about one hour, which I imagined a sufficient tax on the courtesy of some and on the patience of others, and I think to the entire satisfaction of my good friend Mr. Avery.

We arrived at Nashville about 8 o'clock in the evening, on the day appointed, after a voyage of twelve days, and were very agreeably and cordially received by our brethren in that city. I need not speak particularly of the hospitality of the brethren in the reformation in any section of the country which we have visited. We have always found it such as we wished; and I would to Heaven that all the disciples were as eminent in all the christian graces as in their hospitality to brethren and strangers. We abode with our much esteemed and faithful brother *Henry Ewing*, during our visit to the city, and made a few excursions into the country—on one occasion as far as Franklin, in company with our old and much devoted brother *Foster*, who seems to increase in zeal and diligence as he approaches the Jordan. "The path of the just is like the light that shines more and more unto the perfect day."

It would be impossible for me, and no way profitable to our readers, to go into the minuteness of the details of the happy times and seasons we experienced in the company of the faithful brethren and sisters in Tennessee. During three weeks we conversed with them publicly, and from house to house, on the great affairs of life and immortality. We addressed the citizens and the church, in the way of public speeches, about eighteen times while in that state. The grand object of our tour being rather to disabuse the public ear of all the misapprehensions and misrepresentations of the opponents of the

Digitized by Google

cause we plead, and to set the matter fairly before the minds of all interested to know the truth, than simply to make disciples—we labored those points most fully that were most generally misunderstood. In all places we obtained a very favorable and as general a hearing as could be wished under all the circumstances. Most generally no house could be found large enongh to accommodate all who wished to attend—so eager are the people for information on the subject of our pleadings with this generation.

Indeed, the citizens of Nashville especially, and some other places on the waters of the Ohio, are so belabored with the partizan spirit of proselytism, that sensible persons are disgusted, and intelligent and modest preachers are almost ashamed to appear importunate in their beseechings with sinners to flee from the impending vengeance of insulted Heaven. The crisis also in that city was not propitious. The cholera converts, of which there are too many in most places, were about being delivered from their panic-begotten faith, some already apostate, and others apostatizing. In the midst of such a reaction it is no easy matter to rally the public mind, and to induce men to incline their ear with a determination to know and obey the truth. Persons fascinated by the eloquence of a Moffit—by the melody of a musical voice, and the graces of muscular action—converted they know not how, and christians they know not why, are, like *morning glories*, prepared to vanish at the opening day. Those alarmed into religious profession by the panic of any impending ruin, by the horrors of a visitation from that fell destroyer, the *Cholera*, are likewise of doubtful character, and generally of ephemeral duration. So it was that some of the Pastors in Nashville, for some time past, were more engaged in cleansing their respective sanctuaries than in receiving new converts to the ranks. Twenty, or twenty-one, only were added to the church of Christ during our stay in that city.

The church now counts about six hundred members, and employs brother *Fanning* as its evangelist. This devout, and ardent, and gifted brother, about finishing his academic studies in the University of Nashville, under the presidency of the justly celebrated Doctor *Lindsley*, one of the most talented, learned, and liberal of American Presidents, cannot make full proof of his ministry, and therefore only labors occasionally in the word and teaching. He expects to graduate next September, and is desirous of fitting himself for permanent and extensive usefulness.

The congregation in Nashville, I am happy to say, evince a full determination to do their duty. They possess talent and information amply sufficient for their growth and edification, and only want a more general and undeviating attendance on the part of all the members to the ordinances of the Lord's house, without which christian churches can no more grow in grace than Indian corn on the Grampian Hills, remote from the heat and moisure of an American climate, can equal that in the Valley of the Mississippi. This church has exerted, and still exerts a very useful influence on the surround-

Digitized by Google

ing country, and I pray God that they may reap a rich reward in the day of the Lord Jesus.

Since my last visit to Nashville several new churches have been formed in different parts of the country, and some two or three in the vicinity of the city. To the origin and prosperity of these new congregations brother *Hardin* has, by word and deed, especially by the influence of christian example, greatly contributed. The success of his personal and rather private efforts, without the aid of public speaking, ought to stir up others to study how they may promote the permanent interests of their contemporaries. That christians in private stations of life can do little to build up the cause of righteousness and life, is, though a common, a very ruinous and fatal mistake. I could wish that all who have influence, and who know not how to use it, for the honor of the Lord and for the good of men, had such examples before their eyes as our good brother Hardin silently and unostentatiously presents to his acquaintance. Then might they learn that a private christian, by the force of good example, and a word or two seasonably spoken, may add more members to the church, year by year, than a popular preacher, unaided by these auxiliaries

Our excellent brother *Craig* is still healthy and hearty in the work of the Lord. We had the pleasure of much of his company while in his neighborhood. The church in Franklin is prosperous in the Lord, and bids fair to be greatly useful. It has youth, zeal, intelligence, and talent on its side. They want a good and capacious meeting house, which, it is hoped, the liberality of the brethren and the illiberality of certain aliens may speedily furnish.

We had the pleasure of seeing many excellent brethren and sisters who visited Nashville during our sojourn, from the distance of from 20 to 60 miles round. Among these are some young brethren of much promise, full of zeal and devotion to the cause of truth. They, in common with all young disciples of high conceptions and daring enterprize, need only to add to their courage, *knowledge*. This, indeed, requires not only the labors of the mind, but the discipline of years. We seldom find "the wisdom of age" united with "the sallies of youth." "Old men for counsel, and young men for war," as saith the proverb. But one lesson ought to be taught with all benevolence, and learned with all care;—that is, the utility and beauty of comeliness. Is it, for example, comely that a young man, who has only crossed the threshold of the temple of knowledge, should inveigh with all vehemence against the weakness of science, which he has never studied—against the errors of philosophy, which he has never learned—against the utility of literature, which he has not acquired? Neither is it comely for those who have devoted themselves to the proclamation of the word, to entertain their hearers with the vices of sectarianism and the follies of Doctors of Divinity—to excite the indignation, or the smiles of their hearers at the follies of superstition, while their avowed object is to win souls to Jesus Christ. He that speaks for Jesus Christ ought to think only of what Jesus Christ

Digitized by Google

wishes him to say while employed in leading men to him, who leads all his followers to glory eternal in the way of humility and love.

Our good brother *Adams* has proclaimed the word with great success in Davidson and Williamson counties. His efforts, not his zeal, have abated during the last year, in consequence of having married a wife. This indulgence the Mosaic institution sanctions for one year only. It is expected he will soon enter the field again, as his sister wife is in quest of laurels that never fade.

The pleasure of meeting and congratulating our fellow-citizens and brethren in the kingdom of heaven on our earthly pilgrimage, has soon to give place to the solicitude of pain and parting. The more elevated and refined the social pleasures in the seasons of sweet communion, the more irksome and unpleasant the thought of the hour of separation. But that hour must arrive. All that meet on the journey of life must as certainly part, as all that are born must die. The tear of joy which brightens the eye at the moment of greeting, precedes but a little the pang that dims the vision at the hour of parting. But this is a vale of tears. In heaven alone is the fulness of joy, and the social pleasures that never end.

We had a trying hour in the church of Nashville, while we sang the parting hymn. Monday morning a considerable number of the disciples met at the river to witness the burial of some who had just confessed the Lord. From the baptism we repaired to the steam boat, accompanied in primitive style with many of the disciples, who, in the midst of mutual benedictions, bid us adieu. On earth we do not expect all to meet again; but may it be our happy lot to stand approved before the Lord when he comes, and in the palace of the universe to join the triumphant song, and to participate in the fulness of joy, and the everlasting pleasures of being forever with the Lord!

EDITOR.

Reformation---No. 6.

SINCE ever there was a defection in any instituted religion, all good men have been on the side of reform. Under the present dispensation a reformer, approved of God, is neither more nor less than a christian. If he is less than a christian, he must reform himself before he set about the reformation of others; and if he think he is more than a christian, he ought to reform his creed.

The theory of christianity and the gospel is much better understood, and is more popular than the practice. To be a practical christian is the greatest glory and the highest honor to which a mortal can attain. I was much censured the other day for saying, that in heaven no man should wear a crown that did not win it. "This," said an intelligent brother, "is destructive of grace, and gratifying to our natural pride." Be it so—I am in good company; for the Great Teacher said that "he that overcomes," or conquers, "shall sit on my throne, as I have conquered, and sat down with my Father on his throne." Can any one conquer who does not fight! The conqueror alone shall wear the crown. This is what I mean by winning it. Paul's hope of the crown was founded upon his having kept the faith, and having triumphantly finished his course. He that hopes for a crown on better terms than Paul obtained it, will be clothed with shame.

Digitized by Google

How long will it be before christians can be disabused on the subject of grace? Men are justified and sanctified, or introduced into the christian *state*, by pure favor. Men are as passive in being born again as they were in the first birth. No man is commanded to regenerate himself. No man is expected to baptize himself. A man is always dead in the same sense in which he is buried, and in no other sense. But a person may be dead in one sense, and alive in another; active in one sense, and passive in another at the same time. Hence every man enters the kingdom of heaven by a death, burial, and resurrection, all in the same sense.

But life is an active thing. Motion is as essential to life as to time. Hence christian character is not of grace, as is the christian state. God makes the apple to grow upon the tree, and so loads the bough with fruit that it bends down to our grasp; but he does not, he cannot, eat the apple for us. We must eat it for ourselves. So makes he the salvation by the Messiah accessible to all as a matter of pure favor. But he cannot receive the salvation for us. He can *give*, and we must *receive*.

We never can *deserve* from God, as a matter of right; but as a matter of favor. If Augustus Cesar, who had many provincial crowns to bestow, proposed a crown to such of his Generals as would occupy a certain strong hold and quell an insurrection, the General who did so would claim the crown because of the gracious terms on which it was offered, feeling, at the same, time that Augustus had a right to demand his best efforts, as his servant, without such a reward, and that there was no proportional value between his services and the honor proposed. But if the Emperor was graciously pleased to propose such a prize, the faithful and valiant General could confidently expect it.

If, then, Jesus says, "The conqueror" (in this good fight of faith) "shall inherit all things"—"I will allow him to eat of the tree of life in the midst of the Paradise of God"—"I will give him a white stone, and upon the stone a new name written, intelligible to none but to him who receives it"—"I will give him the morning star"—"I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God, and inscribe upon him the name of my God and the name of the city of my God"—"He shall receive no injury from the second death"—"Be faithful till death, and I will give you the crown of life;" I say, if Jesus himself thus speaks by his spirit to all the congregations, and commands every one who has an ear to regard it, ought we to be censured because we say that crowns are not to be won by wishing or by praying, or through, or in consequence of, a mere act of favor, irrespective of any of the conditions or commandments of God!

I have been at unnecessary pains, some may think, to obviate this mistake; but our experience authorizes us to say, that this notion of future salvation and judgment according to grace alone, lies like an incubus upon the christian community. It is no where said that in the final judgment men will be rewarded *according to God's grace*, but every where it is said they will be rewarded *according to their own works*. Jesus began to teach, saying, "Not every one who says Lord, Lord, shall inherit the kingdom of heaven; but he that *does the will* of my Father who is in heaven." And the Holy Spirit ends by saying, "Happy they *who do his commandments*, that *they may have a right* to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Such is the Alpha and the Omega of the New Institution.

Brethren, be assured that the crown of glory will never adorn the brows of a lazy, indolent, cowardly, talking, praying, and boasting professor. Up, and be doing! It is high time to awaken out of this Calvinian, Sandemanian, Antinomian dream. Force your entrance through the strait gate—walk along the narrow way—run the christian race, looking to Jesus—see how he acted—making him the model of your imitation, keep his commandments as he kept his Father's commandments; and you shall inherit his honors, share his glory, and dwell forever in his presence.

EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

Obituary.

For the gratification of a numerous family connexion, and of an extensive circle of interested acquaintance, both in this and in the land of our nativity, whom we have not leisure to address particularly—we have consented to publish the following communication relative to the decease of our beloved mother.—EDITOR.

Bethany, Friday, May 1st, A. D. 1835.

ALICIA-ANNE CLAPP—

Dearly beloved Daughter—It becomes my painful duty to inform you of the decease of your worthy and beloved mother. She departed this life on Tuesday, the 28th ultimo, about 5 o'clock, P. M. aged 71 years and 8 months. She had been confined to her room, though not to her bed, for nearly two weeks. Last Sunday we had a meeting, as usual, in son M'Keever's; and she still felt able to come down stairs, and recline on bed in the adjoining apartment, though not to be present with us. She spent a very restless night—had complained much of a pain and soreness in her stomach and left side, for some two or three weeks previous; but was still able to dress and undress, to lie down and get up, without much or any assistance; till about 10 o'clock next day (Monday) the day prior to her decease; at which time she manifested a slight degree of mental confusion; but by means of a gentle opiate, seemed so far relieved of her pain as to produce a disposition to repose, which she much needed, having slept but little the night preceding. She continued thus to doze and awake, by intervals, without manifesting any disposition to speak, except to ask occasionally for a drink of water. On Tuesday morning, between 5 and 6 o'clock, she seemed to awake as out of a troublesome sleep, and seeing your brother Archibald and myself standing at the bedside, she asked us, with apparent difficulty, what we thought of her case. I said, My dear, you are going to your gracious heavenly Father. She replied, Yes, my keeper—my preserver—I want my keeper—my preserver; meaning, as we understood, her desire to be with him; for she spoke with labor and difficulty. I said, You are going to the blessed Saviour. She reiterated with a look and tone of expressive interest and resignation,—My salvation—my salvation—this great salvation! Thrice, at least, she distinctly uttered these soul-cheering, heart-consoling words. Pausing a little, I said, My love, the Lord Jesus will shortly receive your spirit. These words, with a most expressive look of deep-felt complacency, she attempted to reiterate; but apparently unable to repeat them all distinctly, she dwelt upon the last part of the sentence, which she repeated twice or thrice,—"Receive my spirit—my spirit;—he will receive my spirit." I said, My dear, you can say them in your heart, and the Lord will hear you. He will shortly give you a voice to praise him. Perceiving her unable to reply, we ceased to add. But—O! the meek, composed serenity!—the unanxious submissive resignation! which she manifested; not only at the trying moment of these communications; but, indeed, all along, from the commencement of her illness, patient, uncomplaining submission, was the constant tenor of her deportment. She had labored, less or more, under the influence of a troublesome phlegmatic cough, from the beginning of winter, but with frequent intervals of relief. Even four weeks before her decease, she appeared for some time to be getting much better; nor, indeed, did we apprehend any thing seriously dangerous in her condition, till part of the last two weeks; nor even at the last, was she unable to assist herself, as far as necessary, but for a part of two days. For the last 24 hours she manifested little or no symptom of pain, but only a laborious breathing, occasioned by a collection of phlegm in the region of the lungs; and, for about fifteen minutes before she expired, she lay as tranquil as if asleep;—her eyes were close shut, without moving hand or foot, without the least struggle, she thus breathed her last.

But, O my daughter, what a lesson has her decease taught me! I learned more of God, of Christ, and of myself, from the last twenty-four hours of her life, than I think I have done for the last twenty years—yes, in some sort, than I had ever learned in all my past life. I would not, for all the worldly en-

Digitized by Google

joyments of twenty years of the most healthful activity, have been deprived of the benefit of having been present with your dying mother, the last week of her precious life. What an inestimable benefit the Lord conferred upon me, in the days of my thoughtless, inexperienced levity, in putting such a jewel into my bosom. She had been trained up in the fear of the Lord from her early infancy,—the only and tenderly beloved daughter of a pious and early widowed mother, who brought her up with a tender and pious affection, in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Sincere, affectionate, unaffected, and benevolent;—and, I may truly add, beneficent to the utmost of her ability, she took more pleasure in giving than in receiving—in serving, than in being served. Hers was truly, and without ostentation, what the ambitious aspiring heathen proudly assumed as a just ground of enrolment amongs the gods of his country—"Because he had endeavored to imitate them, in having as few wants as possible of his own; and in doing every thing in his power to supply the wants of others." Such, indeed, was *her* truly noble and independent spirit—her kind and generous disposition. Add to these obvious and predominant features of her character, the depth and sincerity of her conjugal and maternal affection—there could not be a more faithful, dutiful wife—a more tender and affectionate mother. Next to, and under Jesus Christ, I was the object of her constant and supreme attachment. We lived together nearly half a century; and I can truly say, she never once disappointed my confidence, in not carrying into effect, as far as possible, every injunction I laid upon her:—and you well know, my dear daughter, that I frequently placed her in very difficult and trying circumstances—not unfrequently with the sole tuition and management of a large rising family; especially at my coming to this country, when, for two long years and a half, the vast Atlantic was between us—and, that even for the last eight years, she was more than the three-fourths of the time deprived of my company. Yet (though with manifest reluctance) to these burdens and privations, for my sake, for her family's sake, and for the truth's sake, as the case might be, she meekly and resignedly submitted. But her hope and comfort was her keeper, her preserver. And, as having been long accustomed to this blessed hope, it was the first thought—the first word that occurred, upon the annunciation of her approaching dissolution. I shall never forget the meek, child-like, submissive look, with which she uttered these soothing, consoling words—*My keeper—my preserver.*

It appears we can never learn any thing but by experience; especially to know God and ourselves. When I said above, that in being present with your pious mother, during the last week of her life, I learned more of God, of Christ, and of myself, than I had ever learned before; I did not mean that I had learned any new attribute divine or human, that I had not learned long ago; but only, that I had learned more affectingly the real import of the divine economy in the constitution and assumption of our nature, with its blissful effects and consequences, than I had ever done before.—I mean especially, the blissful and glorious display of the divine goodness and love; and still *more* especially of the *latter*. It had long been, with me, a favorite maxim, that as "God is love," so "all his works are works of love." But at this trying moment with what peculiar force did it appear! The constitution of the human family is a work of purest, reigning love. A thing most evident, not only from our sensitive and intellectual powers of enjoyment, and the means of gratification with which we were, and still are, surrounded; but more especially, and supremely, from the principle of love—the endearments of conjugal affection, in which the human family was constituted; and out of which it was to grow.—

> "Hail, wedded love! mysterious law! true source
> Of human offspring; sole property in
> Paradise—a Paradise of all things
> Common, else: in *these* the tender charities
> Of father, son, and brother, first were known."

In this heaven-born—love-born constitution, and law of our nature, has God laid, not only the strongest natural foundation of love among mankind; but

Digitized by Google

also the strongest bond of grateful love to draw and unite us to himself, for such a gift. This is that anchor of love and gratitude to God for his unspeakable gift of another—better self; for whose sake a man will cheerfully forsake all things, even life itself, as we see from the beginning; for Adam was not deceived, but his wife, being deceived, was the cause of his transgression;—he rather choosing to lose his life than his wife—to die with her—than to live without her.

The last night I sat with your dear mother, beholding the restless tossings of dissolving nature, and realizing our intimate connexion—the endearing affectionate attachment of her soul to me, what were my feelings towards her, and what the grateful emotions of my heart towards God, the author of this attachment!—and towards our Lord Jesus Christ, by whose expiring agonies I realized her speedy, and ultimate triumphant deliverance from this last enemy, and our happy and eternal re-union in the divine presence. Here again we are presented with a still more transcendant manifestation of the divine love, the exuberant source of this most blissful consolation;—"God manifested in the flesh"—"Immanuel—God with us." Thus identifying himself with us, and redeeming us by his blood. Here is the consummation of his love—"God is love." In this, he has not only made himself forthcoming to *us* for *our* relief and personal enjoyment; but also to all his holy rational creatures: having thus taken a visible tangible form, and so made himself really accessible—an object of real personal intercourse; thus fulfilling the ultimate desire of the strongest personal attachment, that love and gratitude can effect; such as we have Job xxiii. 3.—"O that I knew where I might find him, that I might come even to his seat!"—and in Canticles viii. 1. "O that thou wert as my brother, that sucked the breasts of my mother; when I should find thee without, I would kiss thee; yea, I should not be despised." Both these ardent aspirations have been long since fully answered. And now he, whose pure abstract essence bears no relation to time nor place, being invested with humanity, is thus made truly accessible to the rapturous adorations and embraces of his saints. * * * * But alas! my dear, when I saw your affectionate mother draw her last breath, I felt as if my bond of attachment to the world was cut off, having now no longer any interest in it. And when I saw her laid in the grave, O how it reconciled me to that dreary mansion as to a peaceful home—a safe retreat from a busy, bustling, weary world. And now, henceforth realizing her intellectual existence in the unknown regions of the blessed, who, like her, departed this life in the exercise of a divine faith, I feel a drawing, reconciling interest in, and a consequent attachment to, that better country, which I never felt before; something like the sweet endearing thoughts of home. Something, I suppose, like what my beloved felt in relation to this country, during her detention in the land of her nativity after my departure thence, and safe arrival here:—A feeling strong enough to subdue her female timidity to such a degree, as to induce her, after having already suffered an appalling shipwreck, to commit herself, and her dear children, a second time, to the fearful hazards of a tremendous ocean. Such, indeed, are my present feelings towards the strange, unseen country, whither my beloved has gone. I now think of *it* in relation to *her*, as the only known object of an entire personal attachment *there*. When I think of *her*, I think of *it;* and of *it*, because *she* is there. There still remains, however, one spot upon earth, to which also, for *her sake*, I feel a strong and distinguishing attachment —*the precious spot where her dear remains are deposited.* There she lies in vicinity with our beloved *Margaret*, your brother *Alexander's* first beloved, in the same blissful hope of a glorious resurrection. And now, dear daughter, what remains for me, thus bereft of my endearing attached companion, from whose loving faithful heart, I am persuaded, I was not absent a single day of our fifty years connexion.—Yes, what now remains for me, without any worldly care, or particular object of worldly attachment,—but, with renewed energy —with redoubled diligence, as the Lord may be graciously pleased to enable, to sound abroad *the word of life*—the praises of him who has called us out of darkness into his marvellous light, and has thus blessed us. And at last, if it

Digitized by Google

be the will of God, to have my mortal remains deposited alongside of your beloved mother's.

O blessed word of life! Who—possessed of human sympathy,—that has tasted of thy sweets, but would wish all to partake of thy blissful consolations; especially in the trying season of unavoidable calamity, seeing "man is born to trouble, as the sparks fly upwards." But, alas for infidelity! that blighting, woful, deadly evil!—which goes to rob us of thy benign, heart-cheering solace. O, my daughter, may it be your happy privilege and mine to live it, to enjoy it; and thus to diffuse among our acquaintance the balmy influence of its soothing, life-giving communications—And at last, filled with its blissful hopes, to depart in the lively exercise of a triumphant faith!

I remain, my dear daughter, your affectionate father,

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

FROM THE SOUTHERN CHURCHMAN.

JOHN RANDOLPH.

FROM the following letters it will appear, that there were times when the subject of religion strongly exercised the mind of Mr. Randolph. He was in some respects a most remarkable man. In relation to his religious character, we have not formed, and therefore cannot express, an opinion. In his best days he wrote, spoke, and acted as a christian; but at other times his deportment was much opposed to such a character. How far the last may have been the acts of an irresponsible being, it is not for us to decide.

RICHMOND, May 19th, 1815.

My dear Sir—It is with very great regret that I leave town about the time that you are confidently expected to arrive. Nothing short of necessity should carry me away at this time. I have a very great desire to see you; to converse with you on the subject, before which, all others sink into insignificance. It continues daily to occupy more and more of my attention—which it has nearly engaged, to the exclusion of every other; and it is a source of pain as well as occasional comfort to me. May He who alone can do it, shed light upon my mind, and conduct me through faith to salvation. Give me your prayers. I have the most earnest desire for a more perfect faith than I fear I possess What shall I do to be saved? I know the answer, but it is not free from difficulty. Lord, be merciful to me a sinner. I submit myself most implicitly to his holy will, and great is my reliance on his mercy. But when I reflect on the corruption of my nature, I tremble whilst I adore. The merits of an all-atoning Saviour I hardly dare to plead, when I think of my weak faith. Help, Lord, or I perish; but thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. I know that I deserve to suffer for my sins, for time misspent, faculties misemployed; but above all, that I have not loved God and my neighbor as we are commanded to do. But I will try to confide in the promises we have received, or rather to comply with their conditions. Whatever be my fate, I will not harbor a murmur in my heart against the justice of my Creator

Your afflicted friend, JOHN RANDOLPH, of Roanoke.

Rev. WILLIAM MEADE.

ROANOKE, September 1st, 1815.

My dear Sir—I have delayed too long to thank you for your truly kind letter of the 14th of July, which has lain unanswered, or rather unacknowledged, for more than three weeks. The kind interest which you take in my welfare is most grateful to me in my present state of mind, yet not unexpected—and so far from finding your letter tedious, had it consisted of as many quires as it contains sheets, I should not have found it too long. I wish I could tell you that my mind is in a more satisfactory state than when I wrote to you from Richmond. Of this world and its affairs I am sick to loathing, and of nothing more than of myself. I feel that there is no coincidence of circumstances that could contribute to make me tolerably happy, without better assurance than I have of reconciliation to God. Could I command events—could wealth, power, youth, health, all the supposed constituents of earthly happiness, come at my bidding, I still feel that there would be something wanting to fill the void in my heart; and that I would prefer sickness, and poverty, and sorrow, and shame for my portion in this life, provided I might look forward with an humble hope of acceptance by him that made me. When I look around upon my fellow-sufferers and fellow-sinners—

"I see that all are wandorers, gone astray
Each in his own delusion; they are lost
In chase of fancied happiness, still woo'd
And never won. Dream after dream ensues;
And still they dream that they shall still succeed,
And still are disappointed."

Sometimes I am tempted to wish that I could dream too; but I am wide awake to the sad reality that unless it comes from above, there is no comfort for me even in this world. This conviction ought to produce a correspondent spirit of piety and prayer; and yet I do not find such to be the case. Sometimes I am callous and dead to a degree that excites my own wonder—at others, I have hardly the heart to pray. Meantime, my duties are neglected, and things and persons become indifferent to me that once excited the highest interest. Indeed, how contemptible are the

Digitized by Google

mighty affairs and concerns of this life to any one who will take a serious view of them! Suppose that it could even endure to the age of the Patriarchs, what are its enjoyments that they should fill the soul of a rational creature!

I lay open my thoughts to you, my good sir, with a freedom that knows no reserve, and I entreat the continuance of your good advice and of your prayers for my salvation. By a great many, perhaps, the major part, I am considered as a fanatic or a hypocrite. That does not disturb me at all; but this does—that I cannot mingle with my fellow men as I was wont, without giving or taking offence. So that I feel a strong repugnance at the thought of going abroad, and shrink from the idea of spending the ensuing winter at Washington; I even think seriously of retiring from a station which is as unfit for me as I am for it. I must now close this long strain of egotism; but we are allowed to detail to our physician our maladies and bad feelings. Adieu, my good friend, and may every blessing attend you. Your obliged,

JOHN RANDOLPH of Roanoke.

Rev. WILLIAM MEADE.

ROANOKE, December 21st, 1818.

Yes, my dear sir, you have "a right" to address me as you have done. Your claims upon me are the last that I shall disavow.

The prayer of a righteous man availeth much, and I am persuaded that yours and Mr. Hoges' have been earnestly offered up in my behalf. I find it impossible, at this time, and on paper, to enter into the detail which you intimate a willingness to hear. But He, who in his own good time (blessed be his holy name!) spoke peace to my almost despairing soul, has informed your heart of what has passed within my own. I can compare it to nothing so well as the dawning sun after a dark tempestuous night. Then it was—and not till then—that I confidently believed. I knew what was passing in the minds of all to whom similar mercy had been extended; and when, a few weeks afterwards, I took up at an inn on the road, for the first time, the Life of John Bunyan, I found a perfect coincidence between his feelings and my own. I also wrote a few lines to Frank Key, to apprise you and him that at last I had found pardon and peace—that peace which passeth all understanding—requesting, as the only requital I could make for your kind interest in my welfare, that it might be communicated to you. This, no doubt, he has done. My excellent friend, Dr. Hoge, to whom I had made known my state of mind, wrote me a long letter; and I am struck with the entire coincidence of his opinion and yours, although I knew it must be so, EX NECESSITATE REI. Be assured there is not one to which I do not heartily and humbly assent. Continue to give me your prayers, my dear sir, now more than ever needful to me. I will cherish the hope that we may yet meet in this life, when I shall be gratified in laying open, as far as possible, the process of that change which it has pleased infinite mercy to work in the temper and disposition of my soul; but should this hope (as what earthly expectations may not) be disappointed, may we meet where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest. Excuse this abrupt reply to your most kind and welcome gratulation; and believe me, in sincerity of heart, your friend,

J. R. of Roanoke.

FROM THE CHRISTIAN PALLADIUM.

"Campbellism is doing much harm in this country. Uncharitableness, neglect of prayer, and death, are its general companions. Tell your writers to persevere; but mind and keep the humble spirit of Christ."

Thus writes Mr. Matthew Gardner, of Ohio, to his brethren in the East. But we wish to ask a question or two—What is uncharitableness? Who neglects prayer? Who have died by the introduction of the above contagion? And can it not be said to this gentleman, "Physician, heal thyself," by those whom he admonishes?

[Mr. Gardner has long gloried in the name *Christian*. What will his brethren in the West, who have long known how frail he is, think of this compliment! There is one precept in the decalogue, which Jesus Christ did not abolish: we would recommend it to his consideration. If I forget not, it is usually called the ninth commandment.

Ed. M. H.

☞ *My detention from home ten days beyond the period contemplated, has interfered with the regular series of essays on some subjects; and also prevented the insertion of some pieces recently received, among which is a communication from Mr. Meredith, of North Carolina—to which we will attend in our next.*

EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number VII.——Volume VI.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. July, 1835.

To Dr. James Otey, Bishop of Tennessee.

Letter III.

MY DEAR SIR,

SINCE my arrival at home, I have paid some attention to the polemic labors of Dr. Cooke and Dr. Chapman on the subject of diocesan episcopacy. Since doing this, I appreciate still more your good sense in commending to my particular examination the tract written by Bishop Onderdonk. He rests the argument where it ought to rest—upon scripture testimony. His is the only question worthy of grave consideration—"*Has it the authority of scripture?*" To this test alone he invites our attention; and most logically: for, sustained by scripture testimony, it must stand though all the world oppose; and, destitute of this, it must fall, though synods, and councils, and primitive fathers should all concur in attesting its high antiquity.

Mr. Chapman, of Lexington, Ky. seems to have acquired the full assurance of understanding, and to speak with the confidence of an apostolic father on the divine constitution of the three orders. That his work should have exerted so powerful an influence on the mind of so good and ardent a Methodist as was Dr. Cooke, especially at the time he read it, is to me not at all surprising. Imposing in his style—mild, firm, and sufficiently dogmatical in his temperament—well versed in the politics of episcopalian government, he has written a book not only respectable in size, but well adapted to convert a believer in Episcopal Methodism to the true faith of the divine right of the Greek, Roman, German, and English Episcopacy.

This zealous champion *courageously* affirms that "the Roman Catholics wherever situated, the very extensive denomination called the Greek Church in Russia and Turkey in Europe, and in some parts

Digitized by Google

of Asia, including the Holy Land itself; the Armenians also of Asia; the Abyssinians of Africa; the Swedish and many of the German Lutherans; such as belong to the established churches in England and Ireland, with a respectable church in Scotland; all these, brethren, are as much Episcopalians as we are: they maintain as strongly the apostolic institution of episcopacy, and reject as openly every other form of church government, because in their opinion founded solely upon the basis of human authority. I might add to this catalogue, the large and zealous body of christians scattered over our own country, and the land of our fathers, known by the name of Methodists, who are Episcopalians in principle; although for reasons which will hereafter be briefly submitted, we are constrained to consider them, unpossessed of the requisite authority; in other words, of what we claim to be a valid episcopal ministry."

He is yet more bold; for he makes the temple rather than the synagogue the model of the christian ministry. These were the types of the *good things* to come. The priests under the law were the types of the good things called Episcopal priests; and the *Levites* were the types of the deacons of his church. True, he is cautious in making the high priest of the temple the type of that good thing, *the Pope*. But, with this little exception, he goes with the Roman church ministry to the beginning of the chapter. His words are:—"In the Jewish church there were three orders in the ministry—the High Priest, Priest, and Levites. The first having greater dignity and power than the second, and the second than the third. In the Christian church the same distinction in relation to number and authority, has always obtained. It was thus during the actual ministry of Christ. He himself occupied the first rank—the twelve Apostles the second—and the seventy disciples the third." p. 19.

"To me it most clearly shows the actual accomplishment of Paul's declaration, that the law was a shadow of good things to come—a shadow, among other particulars, of the church, the sacraments, and *the priesthood of the gospel*." p. 20.

I believe, sir, that the Doctor has outstripped all his generation of clergy in the antiquity of the christian church; for with him it began in Galilee, and not in Jerusalem: it began with the public ministry of Jesus, and not on the Pentecost after the ascension!!

Bishop Onderdonk appeals to the Bible alone; and, therefore, we shall continue our examination of his plea, as I perfectly agree with you that it is the most manly and sensible defence of diocesan episcopacy in our land. I am sorry to find that our worthy author of "*Episcopacy tested by Scripture*," has followed in the train of all his predecessors in taking for granted the very point to be proved—indeed, the main question. He has assumed, without seeming to notice it, the foundation of the Apostacy. He has taken for granted that there is *a succession in the office of Apostles*—a hereditary line of descendants in one office. (Ought there not, then, to be but thirteen bishops?)

Digitized by Google

Among the cardinal assumptions in this tract the following are peculiarly worthy of notice:—

1. That there is a divinely authorized succession in the christian ministry.

2. That the Christian Bishops are the successors of the Apostles.

3. That Timothy was Bishop of Ephesus.

4. That none but Bishops can ordain to any office in the christian church.

In the first of these assumptions he is countenanced by all the principal sects in christendom; and this is the main reason why Dr. Miller and all the Presbyterian opponents of your system assail your arguments so inconclusively, and why the Roman Catholics so arrogantly upbraid you both. You all agree in the same fundamental point, and only differ in the application of one common assumption.

To examine, then, this assumption with all candor and diligence, is our first duty in deciding on the real merits of the tract before me. To an unsophisticated mind it would appear sufficient to state that there is not a single intimation in the New Testament that authority to preach, teach, ordain to office, or dispense ordinances, was vested by the Messiah in any line of succession from the Apostles. No such office was by him created; and, therefore, there is no provision made for descent—for preserving pure and uncorrupt such a line in all succeeding times.

In the Jewish Institution it was quite otherwise. The common priests and the high priest were of one family, concerning which Moses said much about office prerogative and succession: "Their anointing [or ordaining] shall surely be an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations."* "The son of Aaron [Phineas] the priest shall have the priesthood, *and his seed after him*, even the covenant of an everlasting priesthood."* But Jesus Christ intimates nothing of this sort concerning the office of apostles, prophets, bishops, or deacons. In the absence of such a law, it may well be questioned whether any inferential or analogical reasonings could satisfy a tender conscience, or authorize an institution as positive in its nature as the commonwealth of Israel. In matters of morality we may reason much, and reason conclusively; but it is not the province of reason to institute a divine ordinance of positive authority. And such would be, in fact, an office to transmit legitimate authority from the person of one occupant to the person of another.

But may it not be asked whether such a succession as the assistant bishop of Pennsylvania contemplates and assumes, would not be wholly anomalous on all other notions of succession in every other part ofGod's dominions. The predecessor in every other line always becomes extinct before there can be a successor. But in this we have the predecessor and successor as contemporaneous co-ordinates in a thousand instances. If Timothy, or any, or all of the Ephesian bishops, were Paul's successors in office, they became so at the time of their ordination. Then Paul's jurisdiction ceased, else we have him and

* Exodus xl. 15. * Numbers xxv. 13.

Digitized by Google

his successors as co-ordinates in office, simultaneously exercising the episcopancy with co-extensive authority over the same churches: and if their authority and office were not co-extensive in every branch and function, then were they not his successors.

The Roman and Greek Catholics, pressed, no doubt, with this anomaly, made all hereditary official grace and authority flow in one channel, and wisely made Peter the successor of Christ after he was crucified; and Linus the successor of Peter after Peter was defunct; and so on, down to Pope Leo. But his episcopacy embraces all the church.

The Protestants, however, give no precedence to Peter as the Vicar of Christ, and regard all the thirteen Apostles as perfect co-ordinates: thus dividing into thirteen rivulets all that flows in one channel from the Tarpeian Rock, on which stands Saint Peter's Church, and the old-fashioned elbow-chair on which the Galilean fisherman used to sit while Cesar did homage at his feet.

Those thirteen rivulets have, however, so branched out, and so divided, that now their hair-breadth channels are so contracted, that a single drop of the official grace of Peter would burst their embankments and inundate all the circumjacent country. So invisible to the naked eye is the current of this authority, that if all that flows in the persons of the twenty-four English bishops was now collected into one channel, it would require more than the genius of a Herschel to construct a glass of such magnifying power as to enable us to discover whether the current flows backwards or forwards.

But from this curious speculation to return to the palpable question of succession, may we not say that there is no succession in the office—that the office and the officer must be regarded as two distinct things—that the office is one and indivisible—and that the succession is in the officers and not in the office—that the number of offices must be always as numerous as the communities or sees; that a bishop without a charge is as anomalous as an eye without a body, or an ear without a head, and that therefore the community must always precede both the office and the officers.

Now, as there were only thirteen sees in the apostolic age—twelve in the confines of Judea, and one in all the rest of the world, there could be at most thirteen bishops as successors of the Apostles in those sees; for if a new diocess were constituted, and a new bishop created, he could not be the successor of any one of the original thirteen; and if by any revolution his see should become extinct with his life, he would be a priest after the order of Melchisedek—without predecessor or successor, and not after the order of Aaron.

I admit that the merits of the question at issue depends not at all upon such reasonings. These remarks are only illustrative of the anomalous character of the succession for which many Protestants contend, who, while they remonstrate against the pretensions of the Pope to the chair of St. Peter, do nevertheless set up claims upon the same footing, equally proscribed by the oracles of reason—by the elements of both natural and conventional succession, and by the statutes of holy writ.

Digitized by Google

But the jet of this controversy in this one point, is found in the fact that not one of the Apostles has hinted to us that there was in their order any succession; or that they were the first of a series to be continued through all generations, by which authority to preach, teach, baptize, and dispense the ordinances, was to be legally communicated by Jesus Christ to a certain class of individuals, to the constitutional exclusion of all other persons. Now as Bishop Onderdonk adduces no proof of this—indeed, assumes it as a matter conceded, it will become necessary to make out any scriptural plea for diocesan episcopacy that he, or some one skilful in this much litigated question, make an effort to show that such an economy is contemplated any where by Jesus Christ or his Apostles. When this is attempted it will be in season for us to show in due form that such an idea is incompatible with the genius of the christian institution, and therefore unauthorized by the Book.

But placed in another attitude before the mind, this assumption appears still more unscriptural. According to the Book, the Apostles never were one of three orders, nor one of two orders of officers in the kingdom of the Messiah, but all orders in one as respected the administration of the Reign of Heaven. Indeed, theirs was the authority to *create and fill offices* in the church. Under Christ they instituted the offices and gave directions for the filling them with suitable persons. They originated the offices and gave instructions for the election and appointment of bishops and deacons in the christian communities. The Messiah gave them all his authority as respected the temporal and earthly affairs of his kingdom. While on earth himself he ministered to all, and was the only lawgiver to his subjects. They also, when left as his Apostles to the world, and gifted with the Holy Spirit, officiated as preachers, teachers, deacons, bishops, lawgivers; and if there were any other work necessary to the building of the christian temple, they performed it. It is, then, in our judgment, highly derogatory to the standing of the Apostles, to regard or speak of them as one of three orders of public functionaries in the christian communities.

They condescended to be what is sometimes called deacons, and attended to the serving of common tables in the Jerusalem church. They also condescended to discharge the duties of elders or bishops in particular congregations, though they had "*the care of all the churches.*" But all these duties they assigned to the two offices of bishops and deacons as soon as they found persons competent to discharge them. Till then they were, as the occasion required, servants of Christ in every capacity in the church. They were, indeed, not one of three orders distinct and separate, but all orders of officers in one, as being the stewards of Christ and his ambassadors to the world.

There is yet remaining in the true nature of their office as *Apostles*, one argument, which, of itself, seems to preclude even the possibility of their having any official successors.

The essential attributes of an Apostle are found in the following prerequisites:

Digitized by Google

1. They must have been personal attendants (*huperetes*) on the Messiah, from "his immersion by John until the day of his ascension into heaven," as Peter declared in his statement of the qualifications for a *successor* of Judas.* They must be witnesses of his resurrection, eye witnesses of the doings, and ear witnesses of the sayings of Jesus.

2. They must have a special call and mission from the person of the Messiah as his ambassadors; they must have heard his voice saying, *Go*.†

3. They must have all the authority in every church and in every affair pertaining to the church, that Christ himself would have were he present in his own church. So that in hearing and obeying them, we are hearing and obeying God. "We," says John, "are of God. He that is of God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth us not." "Whose sins," says the Messiah, "you remit, they are remitted; and whose sins you retain, they are retained." In one word, infallibility in all things pertaining to the constitution, doctrine, and administration of the Reign of God was essential to their work and office.

Now, without these qualifications, can any one be a successor of these Apostles of Christ? And are these not the Apostles from whom succession is claimed? Is it not, then, impossible for them to have any official successors!

Paul, although he both saw and heard the risen Lord, and received from him in person a call and mission to the nations—although supernaturally endowed with all the gifts of the Spirit bestowed upon all the others—infallible in all the mystery of Christ, felt himself so *seemingly* (not really) deficient in one respect, (not having been the companion of the Messiah during his earthly ministry) that he represented himself as an Apostle "*born out of due time.*" If, then, Paul, with every other qualification, was in one respect born out of due time, though this was amply compensated by his superabundance of visions and revelations—may we not affirm that all the men now living are born too late to aspire to that order of men whom Christ designated his Apostles to the nations? And can any person be a successor of those Apostles, destitute of not only one, but of all the essential attributes belonging to such officers?

We are canvassing the pretension, wherever found, among Catholics or Protestants, to apostolic succession. It is not succession in time or place, but in office, of which we speak. And in this sense, since the day that Jesus appeared to Saul of Tarsus, there has no man, living or dead, been invested with the office of an Apostle of Christ. A township magistrate in the state of Ohio may as consistently pretend to be the successor of Governor Morrow; or a Captain of the regular army of the United States claim to be the successor of George Washington, as any ecclesiastic on earth assume to act in the official relations of an Apostle of Jesus Christ, or under the pretence of succession to their office.

I doubt not, my dear sir, that if this do not now, it will yet appear to you evident, as that the present incumbent in "St. Peter's Church"

* Acts i. 22. † Acts xxii. 14.

Digitized by Google

of Rome is neither the Vicar of Christ, nor the successor of "the Prince of the Apostles." But of Bishop Onderdonk's plea, more particularly in my next.

With every sentiment of esteem and respect, &c.

EDITOR.

A Word of Apology for the Scotch Baptist Churches in Britain; in a Letter to Mr. A. Campbell.

By Elder William Jones, of London.

LONDON, March 16, 1835.

Beloved brother in Christ!

SINCE I wrote to you, under date of the 3d of September, 1834, the box of books which you kindly forwarded to me has come to hand. Owing to a wrong direction, in which *Sutchill* was substituted for *Critchill* [Place, Hoxton,] my residence could not be made out, and the package lay several weeks in the King's warehouse, so that I did not get it into my possession until about the middle of January of the present year. It was not long after that I had a still further gratification in the reception of your very welcome letter of the 17th of November last; and by both of these you have conferred obligations upon me which I have but slender hopes of ever requiting by any thing I can transmit you from this quarter. May I hope that the small parcel of books and pamphlets which I forwarded to New York, by the gentleman who took charge of them and of my letter, has reached you, and if so it may, at least, serve to testify my good will!

During the few weeks that have elapsed since your communications came into my possession, the claims upon my head and hands have been so numerous and pressing as to leave me but little time for exploring the contents of "The Christian Baptist," and "Millennial Harbinger." However, I certainly have glanced into both these works, and met with sufficient interest in them to satisfy me that they contain very much that will prove acceptable to the friends of the Redeemer's Kingdom in Britain. And as I am not so selfish as to wish to monopolize all these good things, I have commenced a monthly publication, borrowing the title from your own work, the "Millennial Harbinger;" through the columns of which I purpose, so long as it shall please God to spare me and grant me ability to do it, to gratify my brethren and friends here with copies of our correspondence and extracts from your pages. The London edition of the "Millennial Harbinger" commenced its career at the beginning of this month, and I hope to be able to get some copies of it, and of the succeeding numbers, conveyed to you regularly through the medium of Messrs. Joseph Stanley & Co., of New York, who I hope will take charge of them.

Digitized by Google

Before I proceed to offer any remarks upon your letter to me, permit me to express the high and unfeigned satisfaction which it has afforded me to find you, in all your writings, maintaining, with a firm and unshaken hand, the testimony of God concerning his beloved Son, and so earnestly contending for it as "the faith once delivered to the saints;" to which also let me add, your simple and scriptural views of our Redeemer's kingdom. May the exalted head of the church, in whom all fulness dwells, and with whom is the residue of the Spirit, raise up and send into his vineyard many such workmen, for "the harvest truly is great and the laborers few." From my inmost soul do I rejoice in the abundant success with which it has pleased him to crown the labors of yourself and associates, and to his name be eternal praises. Amen.

I feel much obliged, certainly, for the ample illustration which you have given me in your last letter of the paragraph contained in the one you wrote to our brother Wyeth, relative to my old friend "Archibald M'Lean and his coadjutors," by whom I suppose you mean his colleagues Messrs. Braidwood, Inglis, Peddie, and the elders and teachers of other churches in the Scotch Baptist connexion. I have been accustomed to look up to these men as unto fathers in Israel—men who were as heartily attached to the cause of Christ as either you or I, and whose praise is still, I trust, to be found in many of our churches. They labored indefatigably in their Master's vineyard, in their day and generation, contending for the very same things that you yourself are contending for, and the Lord was pleased eminently to bless their labors in sowing the seed of the kingdom, planting churches, and so "building up the walls of Jerusalem." They have labored and we have entered into their labors. It is said, "The memory of the just is blessed." Let us not be ungrateful for the benefits we derive from their conduct, their example, their instructions, whether from the pulpit or the press; and while we pay all due regard to the apostolic injunction, "Let no man glory in men," let us be thankful to HIM who raised them up, qualified them for his service, and bestowed them upon his churches; "by the grace of God they were what they were." With some of these men I deem it a high privilege to have been personally acquainted—several of them were my correspondents for years—all of them honored me with their friendship and affection while living—and God forbid I should be found ungrateful to their memory now that they are no longer among us to speak for themselves!

You will, no doubt, wonder what can have called forth these observations and extorted this eulogium from me; and are ready to reply that you had no intention, by any thing you have said or written, to undervalue these men, or depreciate their labors; and I shall concede that point to you. But while I cheerfully do this, I cannot help expressing my fears that there rests upon your mind some small portion of either jealousy or prejudice, which you may have insensibly imbibed respecting my friends here, and that this has led you to view their characters and services through a distorted medium, and,

Digitized by Google

as a consequence, to think and speak of them with less respect than that to which I think them entitled. Now, I hope you will bear with me, while I briefly lay before you my reasons for entertaining this opinion.

It has fallen to my lot to be connected with the Scotch Baptist Churches in this country during the long period of almost half a century; and, therefore, I think I am as intimately acquainted with their history as most people now living. In a pamphlet which I lately sent you, entitled a "Vindication of the distinguishing tenets of the Scotch Baptist Churches," you will find some account of their origin, and of the fundamental principles on which they set out. These churches took their rise in 1767, when that in Edinburgh was formed, consisting of not more than ten or a dozen members. They have now existed about seventy years, in which time probably not fewer than one hundred societies have been gathered in Great Britain and Ireland, maintaining the same views of the gospel, and of the nature of Christ's kingdom, its laws, institutions, &c. and holding no fellowship with what are designated "English Baptist Churches." That their multiplication and increase in numbers have been greatly promoted, under God, by the writings of "Mr. M'Lean and his coadjutors," can admit of no dispute. By means of these publications the attention of thousands has been drawn to the New Testament as the only authorized rule of the religion of Jesus Christ—their consciences have got disentangled from the traditions of men, and they have been led to yield allegiance to Christ as the alone King in Zion. It is no doubt very true that differences of minor import have arisen among these societies, chiefly relating to the instituted order of the Lord's house, which have marred their unity, and prevented, in some instances, their visible fellowship, yet they have still retained all the fundamental principles of the profession, such as weekly communion, the prayers and exhortations of private brethren, a plurality of elders or pastors, &c. in every church, and these not of the order of the clergy, with the general characteristics of the denomination, so as to form a distinct section or body. I can well remember the time when there was not a single Scotch Baptist Church in all England or Ireland; and can pretty accurately trace in my recollection the rise of those that have since sprung up in all the chief towns and cities where they now exist—London, Liverpool, Manchester, Nottingham, Leeds, Beverley, Hull, Newcastle, Berwick, Whitehaven, Chester, Bath, &c.; and I could also furnish proofs of the obligations that all those societies are under to the Edinburg Church and its elders. I could explain the first introduction of the principles of the Scotch Baptists into Ireland, were it necessary, and show the societies in that part of the empire that they are much more beholden to the churches in Scotland and England than many of them are willing to allow. May I hope for pardon from you, sir, if I add that even the "Reformation" in the United States owes something in the way of gratitude to our Scotch Churches. Hundreds, perhaps I may safely say thousands, of the members of our churches, with their families and friends, have,

Digitized by Google

since the commencement of this century, crossed the Atlantic, carrying their principles along with them, and, like the dispersed of the church at Jerusalem (Acts viii.) helping to sow the seeds of "Reformation." At what period of life my dear friend and brother Campbell first took up his residence in America I know not; but from some intimation which I have met with in the "Cristian Baptist," or "Harbinger," where I find he is spoken of as finishing his education under Dr. Staughton, of Philadelphia, and his family being Presbyterians, I conclude it was at too early a stage of life to allow him to have enjoyed the means of an intimate acquaintance with the history of the churches in our denomination, the doctrinal sentiments held and propagated among them, and the obligations which the friends of primitive christianity, both in Great Britain and America, owe to our "good father M'Lean and his coadjutors;" and this must plead my excuse for going so much as I have done in this place into the subject.

My dear friend, I have long wished for an opportunity of disburthening my mind of some things relating to this topic, and I am glad that your letter has afforded it to me without going out of my way. It never occasioned me much surprise when I have met with flaming professors among the English Baptists, both of the clergy and laity, honestly avowing that "they hated the name of M'Lean," and that if any time it, or an extract from his writings, came before them, they hastily passed it over! All this was in character and keeping; they knew enough of the man and his sentiments to be aware that the tendency and design of both was to undermine their system; but I cannot so easily account for the unworthy treatment they have met with from many others, whose obligations to them are indisputable. Instances of this fact in the conduct of individuals now living I could produce in abundance; but it would be thought invidious, and I spare them. I will, however, specify an instance or two of a different kind. Take, then, the case of the persons who drew up the pamphlet at New York, fifteen years ago, under the title of "The First Part of an Epistolary Correspondence between Christian Churches in America and Europe." Though it is well known that those individuals had gone out from this country and carried their principles with them, is there the smallest reference, in all their narrative, to the source whence they derived them? Excepting that at Glengary, in Upper Canada, any indifferent person who took up the pamphlet and examined its statements for the first time, would be naturally led to the conclusion that all the other societies there mentioned had sprung up independent of the slightest connexion with, or even a knowledge of the existence, the principles, or the writings which have emanated from the churches in this country, and that of Edinburgh in particular! I may confidently appeal to you, my brother, how far the supposition would be well founded! and similar remarks will apply to the numerous societies in Ireland, gathered by the same doctrine, and constituted after the same model, as those in Scotland and England. Were the present a fit time and place for such an undertaking, "I

Digitized by Google

could a tale unfold" respecting the first introduction of the writings of our school into Ireland, where they exploded like a thunder-clap, and drew off the late Mr. John Walker from Trinity College, Dublin, whose example was followed by many others, exciting a spirit of inquiry throughout the whole island, and drawing the attention of numbers to the Holy Scriptures—the "Law and the Testimony." Yet poor Walker chose to set up for himself—studied to find out excuses for not connecting himself with the Scotch Baptists—and labored through life to impress upon his Irish friends and associates, the notion that he was indebted to his own researches alone for the principles he advocated, and that all who had gone before him in the same pursuit "added nothing to him!" In all this there was a childish vanity, which a man of his understanding ought to have been ashamed of. Alas, how little is it that we any of us know of "the truth as it is in Jesus," in comparison of what remains to be known, and how foolish to value ourselves upon our attainments. Surrounded as we are with antichristian darkness, and laboring under the native ignorance, prejudices of education, and erroneous preconceptions of our own minds, we should hail with gratitude every glimmering of light which the Lord of glory may graciously bestow upon us, and follow its leadings in the way to the celestial city. I have ever pitied those individuals who, through the pride and envy of their hearts, have scorned to acknowledge their obligations to the servants of God, whose labors have been so useful to them. Such tempers and dispositions ought to be mortified and subdued, not indulged, as they have been, to the multiplying of sects and parties. How many besides the Roman poet might with propriety adopt his words, "*Sic vos, non vobis.*"

Before I take leave of this part of the subject, will you permit me to draw your attention for a moment to a paragraph which appears in "The Apostolic Advocate"—the *extra* number, published December, 1834, and edited by John Thomas, M. D., Richmond, Virginia. Dr. Thomas has there presented his readers with a "Synopsis of the Apostacy, by which is lineally deduced the descent of all the chief modern Orthodox Churches, from the Apostles' days." In the English branch of the Apostacy, p. 14, he classes "the National Episcopal Church of England, the Puritans, the Brownists, the English Independents, the American Congregationalists, and the Wesleyan Methodists," as constituting "the English branch of the mystery of iniquity;" p. 20. He then proceeds to what he calls "the Genevese branch of the Apostacy," comprising "the Church of Geneva, the National Church of Scotland, the Glassites or Sandemanians, the New Independents or Haldanites!" an unfortunate blunder for the Dale-ites, or societies in connexion with the late Mr. David Dale, of Glasgow. But not to dwell on that which is only one out of a number of mistakes into which Dr. Thomas has been betrayed, you will find, p. 24, the following remarkable words:—"ALL *the sects that arose between* 1685 *and* 1790 *can have no pretensions to the character of Christian Churches*, for during that period, the bodies of the witnesses laid

Digitized by Google

[lay] dead and unburied in the street (Platea) of the city, which runs through the nations of different languages."

Now, my brother, I beseech you to look again at that paragraph, and weigh well its import. The Scotch Baptist Churches, out of which yours in America took their origin, as I think you will not deny, are all placed under the ban, for the most of them arose during that period! I do not know whether Dr. Thomas ever heard of the existence of the Scotch Baptist Churches in this country; but if he did, and thought them unworthy of his notice, you must place his conduct in connexion with the instances above specified—if he did not, he was very incompetent to the task he has undertaken, which, indeed, is but too manifest from all that he has written. However, he is young, and if he be teachable he may learn better in time.

And now, my valued friend, I have a few words to say to you on the subject of the complaints you make in your letters of the opinions and conduct of the churches with which I am associated. I am persuaded that, as regards both these points, you are laboring under mistake and misapprehension.

1. As to what respects the doctrine of the gospel, I am at a loss to perceive wherein your views of this important subject differ from what is universally maintained among ourselves. We hold that the gospel is the testimony of God concerning his Son Jesus Christ, in whom alone there is salvation for guilty, helpless sinners, and that this salvation is, from first to last, of sovereign, rich, and free grace, not of him that willeth or runneth. That Jesus Christ is the gift of God to a perishing world—an effect of God's amazing love—that he is the Son of God, the Christ, or anointed Prophet, Priest, and King of his Church—that by his obedience and sufferings, his death and resurrection, he obtained eternal redemption for his people, from the guilt, power, and consequences of sin, and procured for them everlasting life with himself from the dead—that the ungodly are justified freely by divine grace, *not working but believing* the testimony of God concerning the perfection of the Saviour's righteousness—the infinite value of his blood, and the Father's good pleasure in his finished work, which good pleasure or complacency is demonstrated by raising his beloved Son from the dead, and rewarding him with glory and honor at his own right hand in heaven—that faith is not of ourselves, but the gift of God, and comes through divine illumination. We hold that all who really believe the gospel, receive the blessing of justification, have peace with God, and rejoice in the hope of eternal life—that all true faith worketh by love, purifies the heart, and overcomes the world. We contend that the first duty to which a believer is called, is to be immersed in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, on a personal profession of his faith, by which act of obedience to the divine command he "puts on Christ," becomes an object of brotherly love, and is entitled to a name and a place in the household of faith, to enjoy the privileges of adoption, and partake of divine ordinances, which are the means of edification and of growth in the divine law.

I have thus given you, in few words, a summary of our views of

Digitized by Google

the gospel, and I leave it to you, my friend, to point out in what respects it differs from your own, except in the terms which you have chosen for setting it forth. But you tell me that your Evangelists, "after proving that Jesus is the Messiah, &c. and exhorting the persons present to put themselves under his guidance, tender an invitation to all present, who have not yet put on Christ, to come forward and signify their determination to submit to his government—thus making a draft on the faith of the audience," &c. Now, we do the very same thing—only we carry the matter a point beyond you; for we not only invite and beseech them, but we insist upon it as their first duty, and tell them that by disbelieving the gospel they make God a liar, and by refusing to be immersed (if they believe) they "reject the counsel of God against themselves." Seeing, then, that our faith and practice in no respect differs from your own, permit me to ask once more the ground of your complaint of that defectiveness of "the plan of operations got up by our good father M'Lean and his coadjutors?" But,

2. You tell me that the Scotch Baptists appear to you "to be so straitened by the cords and stays of hyper-Calvinism, that they are afraid to command all men to repent and obey the gospel, lest they should savor of Arminian works, and make void the grace of God. They are so fettered, and manacled, and paralysed by Calvinian metaphysics, that they are unable to utter the strivings of the Holy Spirit; the arguments, remonstrances, and persuasions of Prophets and Apostles."

Indeed! but where is the evidence to be found of all this? Not, I am sure, in their writings, nor yet in their preaching. My brother Campbell must certainly have had some other sect in his eye when penning the above remarks, and must have inadvertently transferred them to the wrong party; for most assuredly they have no foundation whatever when applied to the Scotch Baptists. My recollection, at this moment, does not furnish me with the names of three individuals in the denomination who are tinctured with hyper-Calvinism. Dismiss, then, I beseech you, forever dismiss from your mind such an unfounded hypothesis! Give us credit for a little more common sense, and knowledge of the word of God, than to suppose us "fettered, and manacled, and paralysed" by any human creed. We are just as much trammelled by these things as yourself, and no more. Undeceive your brethren throughout the American continent, who may have adopted the same mistaken opinion of us, and get rid of your prejudices with all imaginable despatch. Let not Ephraim envy Judah, nor Judah vex Ephraim. 'Tis high time that these evil surmisings were at an end. As far as possible, let us strengthen each others hands against the common enemy—the man of sin—the son of perdition. I purpose forwarding you to New York, along with this letter, a few treatises written either by myself or some other of the elders of our churches, which, if they arrive safe, and furnish ample evidence of the truth of what I have now asserted, that in attributing hyper-

Digitized by Google

Calvinistic sentiments to the Scotch Baptists you have clearly mistaken your men.

I have much to say to you on other topics, but I forbear entering upon them here; they shall, if the Lord spare me, form the subject of my next month's letter. Meantime, permit me to subscribe myself,

Your faithful and affectionate friend,

WILLIAM JONES.

Letter to William Jones.

No. V.

My much esteemed and venerable brother Jones,

YOUR favor of the 16th March, fraught with a rich variety of pleasing and profitable intelligence, has been thankfully received, and is herewith presented to our American readers. You have, in the interesting details with which it is replete, enlarged the views of our brethren in the origin and progress of the free and full discussion of the great principles of the Protestant Reformation, viz.—that "*the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants.*" This capital principle, strange as it may appear to most Protestants, so early adopted in Great Britain from the continent of Europe, never began to be fully discussed in Great Britain till the year 1728, about forty years anterior to the date of the churches of which you speak. This is the true origin of the controversy, as far as known to me, which gave to Scotland its real precedence in biblical knowledge.

While I am much pleased to learn that the books I forwarded you finally reached their destiny, I have to express my regret, that, although the valuable works, by which you have more than repaid me, are safe on this side the Atlantic; yet, by some mishap, I have not had the pleasure of receiving them at Bethany. I hope, however, soon to receive them.

I cannot but regard, as a very kind and auspicious incident in the admirable administration of the Heavens, in which there can be no contingency, the occurrence which has opened so wide a door of intercommunication between England and America, on doubtless the most important of all the affairs of the present century connected with the kingdom of the Messiah, as that which your and our publications promise to the English people, whether found in England, Scotland, Ireland, Canada, or the United States: for which I return my unfeigned thanks to the God and Father of our common Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. May he make our correspondence an abundant blessing to all the citizens of his kingdom in the Old World, and in the New; and not to them only, but to the immense multitudes on both continents yet living in the world without God, without Christ, and without hope!

It will be obvious to our readers here, that you have not yet so far or so fully examined our publications, as to distinctly comprehend all the ground which we occupy in pleading the Bible cause. But you have given in the document preceding ample evidence of your cordial

Digitized by Google

attachment to to the grand distinctive and characteristic traits of the cause to which many myriads of the most intelligent and godly citizens of this happy land are most cordially devoted. It adds much to our pleasure to learn that one so well skilled in all ecclesiastical matters and things, in all questions connected with the faithful witnesses, with all the events of two thousand years—one so long and so intimately conversant with all the sacred literature and the distinguished advocates of reformation for the last half century—whose opportunities are not only equal, but indeed superior, to most men living—should, together with so many faithful brethren and churches in Scotland and England, not only approve our course in the main, but have been actually employed, substantially at least, in the very same blessed work, in the very bosom of the most illustrious and highly honored nation on earth. For this, too, we thank God and take courage.

You judge correctly when you say, that I "had no intention in any thing I have written to undervalue the labors of those great and good men"—those eminent fathers in Scotland and England, M'Lean, Braidwood, Inglis, Peddie, &c. Far be it! It is a duty we owe, under Christ, to render honor to whom honor is due—to esteem and respect those whom he has distinguished by high intellectual and moral endowments, and made the honored instruments of good to our race. It is a religious duty to honor all God's benefactors to our fellow-men. Jealousy and envy are the characteristics of a little and contracted mind, and every way at variance with the suggestions of the Holy Spirit. Much more is the spirit of detraction at fault when it robs either God or man of the honor due.

I have not, by a quarter of a century, as much experience as you; and yet I have long since had too much to doubt, even in many good men, the existence of that vainglorious spirit of affected originality, which withholds the meed of praise and grateful acknowledgment to others, for the sake of pluming and adorning oneself with the labors, researches, and discoveries of predecessors and contemporaries.—Along with this we have had to lament the appearance of a haughty superciliousness and disregard for the talents and labors of others on the part of some christians, who either were, or imagined themselves to have been, more highly gifted with better powers of perception and reflection than their fellows. These are certain parts and parcels of the old man which ought to be nailed to the cross, and against which all christians should wage a war of extermination.

That there has been evinced, even among those who have had courage to break with the world and its hierarchies, for conscience sake, something of the leaven of envy, jealousy, and the love of originality—and a disposition to plagiarize, to borrow without the wish to pay, or even to acknowledge the debt, is another proof that man in his best estate is altogether frail.

How much the reformation for which we plead is indebted to the labors of those revered fathers of the Scotch Baptist churches, I am not able to say. For my own part, I am greatly indebted to all the

Digitized by Google

reformers, from Martin Luther down to John Wesley. I could not enumerate or particularize the individuals, living and dead, who have assisted in forming my mind. I am some way indebted to some person or other for every idea I have on every subject. When I begin to think of my debts of thought, I see an immense crowd of claimants—Dilworth and M'Crae, with their spelling-books, stand far back in the group. They, as well as Euclid, and Locke, and Bacon, and Newton, and ten thousand others cast an eye upon me. If all the Hebrew, Greek, Roman, Persian, French, English, Irish, Scotch, and American teachers and authors, &c. were to demand their own from me, I do not know that I would have two mites to buy incense to offer upon the altar to my genius of originalty for the honors vouchsafed me.

How many may have, in the way of moral causation, excited my mind to this train of reasoning, or to the examination of this fact or that incident, I am now, and will be while life lasts, wholly unable to say. But that many individuals of whom I now know nothing, and of whom I never knew any thing, have directly or indirectly set my mind abroach on things divine and human, and led me by a way which I knew not to very important results, I cannot doubt. I was early taught to take nothing upon trust—to think for myself: but who taught him that thus taught me, I cannot tell.

I may, therefore, indirectly be indebted to Archibald M'Lean, for example, much more than I am aware. A few years after my immersion I read one volume of his tracts, and I do not know that I ever have read but his Review of Wardlaw's Lectures—his Reply to Fuller—a Defence of Believers' Baptism—The substance of two discourses preached on Faith, at Kingston-upon-Hull—and a Treatise on the Commission. Some time after my separation from the Presbyterian connexion and my immersion into the ancient faith, a Mr. John Boyle, of Ireland, with whom I formed a slight acquaintance in Scotland, once an Episcopalian Parson, but then converted by John Walker, of Dublin, to Separatism, made me a visit, and presented to me a volume of the above tracts, and thus introduced me to a knowledge of the name of M'Lean.

A few years ago I purchased four volumes of the works of Archibald M'Lean from a Scotch family, the contents of which I have never examined to this moment. I have, just since writing the last period, taken them down from my shelves, and read the tables of contents. I find in them some pieces that I could wish to read, had I leisure; but, with various other good works, I have laid them up for a more convenient season. I know nothing of the works of Messrs. Braidwood, Inglis, and their associates.

But while on the subject of originality and the acknowledgment of literary and moral debts of thought, I soon found that our worthy friend M'Lean and the Edinburg school had drawn largely and liberally from the writings and labors of Robert Ferrier, James Smith, John Glass, &c. that school which began its operations in 1728, about forty years before the date of the Scotch Baptist churches.

Digitized by Google

The testimony of the King of Martyrs, rejected by the Synod of Angus and Mearns, 1728, I regard as the foundation of the Edinburg reform school; and with all the developments and prominent incidents in the history of that controversy I made myself fully acquainted before I commenced my career in the work of reformation.

I paid the same attention to the Whitfield and Wesleyan school, which began its operations about the same time: and, indeed, to all the debates and controversies, from the days of Luther, Calvin, Knox, Owen, Glass, Sandeman, Bellamy, &c &c. &c. down to the Year of Grace 1810; at which time I began to distrust every thing, and *take the Bible alone.* I had *talked* about the Bible alone for some few years before, but all the while used it as a text book; but at this time I began to *take* and *use* the Bible alone as the only and infallible source of *the true light.* And most unhesitatingly can I say, that all my previous reading and study of theology greatly disqualified me from understanding the Book, although I had no doubt derived an immense revenue of ideas, critical and theological, from the labors of all the reformers. But not one of them ever gave a hint, and, from the best of my recollections, there is not to be found in all these reformers a hint upon the true and rational reading of the Book of God. I think I may hazard the assertion, and certainly, from all my recollections, I do assert, that the information found in my prefaces to the historical and epistolary books of the New Testament, and my hints to readers on the proper method of perusing the oracles, are not to be met with in all the writings of the school of 1728, or of the Edinburg school of 1768, nor in the Wesleyan school of from 1721 to 1775.

This egotistic narrative is due to my Scotch and English brethren. I would have them know that we are not ignorant of what has been done in Britain and Ireland; that we are in possession of all their knowledge, and frankly acknowledge our debts to the great and wise and good men who have gone before us. I thank my heavenly Father that I was born at the proper time, and on the best spot on the earth, and surrounded with the best set of circumstances to afford me the best religious education which the 19th century could afford. Ireland gave me a good physical constitution and the elements of a general education; Scotland lent me her aids and her facilities so late as to the autumn of the year 1809. And in America I feel peculiarly happy in having its very best and most intelligent and most ardent sons my coadjutors.*

Brother Jones, tell Scotland that one of her sons, *Walter Scott*, of Edinburg, has been my associate for more than twelve years, and now edits the "*Evangelist*," in Carthage, Ohio. He came to America a Presbyterian, was immersed by one of the Haldanean school, and was the first of our evangelists to republish *viva voce*, with effect, the Jerusalem gospel in the forests of Ohio, reclaimed from the Indians some forty-five years ago. Tell *England* that one of her sons, Dr. *John Thomas*, of London, now edits the "*Apostolic Advocate*," Rich-

* Dr. Staughton imparted nothing to me. You have mistaken the passage alluded to in the Christian Baptist. I never took a lesson from any American Rabbi.

Digitized by Google

mond, Virginia, and preaches with all zeal the faith first promulged in Judea.* Tell them, moreover, that we have several American brethren controlling the press, and issuing their monthly periodicals, devoted to original christianity. There is brethren *Johnston* and *Hall*, of Georgetown, Kentucky, editors of the "*Gospel Advocate;*" brother *Stone*, of Jacksonville, Illinois, editor of the "*Christian Messenger.*" New York and Massachusetts have also commenced two periodicals the present year.

You see, then, that England, Scotland, Ireland, and America are united as they ought to be (of one blood, of one language, of one faith, of one Lord, of one baptism) in the glorious work of restoring the Christian Institution to its primitive simplicity, power, and glory.

Let me add, that some of the sons of Martin Luther also have come under the flag of the original gospel. Two influential and intelligent German Lutheran preachers have recently come heart and hand into the ranks of reformation. Some of the French also, and their descendants in America, the sons of those who fled to this assylum after the revocation of the Edict of Nantz, are in the ranks of reformation; and, true to the principles of their persecuted fathers, lift up their voice for the precious liberty which Messiah bestows upon his people The inhabitants of the Canadas, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, are stretching out their hands across the North American lakes, and saying to our citizens, 'Come over and help us!' Even from Mexico a whisper is heard, saying to us, "Remember that God had made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." And last, though not least of all, some of the remains of the good Old Britons, the Welsh, go heart and soul into the cause we plead, and say, "We will go with you; for God of a truth is among you, and we shall be blessed!"

I would have our English, Scotch, and Irish brethren to know that we are intimately acquainted with all their efforts at reformation, down to Carson on Baptism. I had the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with Greville Ewing and Ralph Wardlaw, of Glasgow; and have heard once, at least, A. Carson, of Tubermore; John Walker, of Dublin; and almost all the men of note that were conspicuous, from 1800 to 1809. When a lad, I listened with pleasure to Cooper and Richards, the evangelists of England, I think, of Lady Huntington's connexion. For though of the strictest sect of the Presbyterian faith, I was always a practical advocate for the duty of "*occasional hearing.*"

But now, brother Jones, after all these acknowledgments for myself and brethren, I have no hesitation in saying, that there will be found views of the Christian Institution *wholly new*, as far as the works of all the schools to which I have alluded are concerned. This I say not from vanity, nor from our pretensions to originalty; but from a conviction, before God, that it is due to all the citizens of Christ's

* Tell them not, however, of those little inaccuracies of the Genevese branch of the Apostacy: impute it to a LAPSUS PENNAE, and to the ardor of his zeal for the original gospel and order of things. He is a chosen vessel.

Digitized by Google

kingdom, in Europe and America, to state that the cause we plead is at least something in advance of even the Scotch, or English, or American Baptists, as I have no doubt will appear to yourself from a careful examination of the books forwarded you.

We have no need of new inventions—we only claim some new discoveries; and these are only so far *new* to us, as we have combined and arranged certain ideas derived from the Book, possessed by myriads before we were born. But is there any thing of which it can be said, 'Behold, this is altogether new'?

In my next, for the sake not of setting up claims for the honor that comes from man, but for the sake of seeking the honor of our Master, we shall state some points that distinguish this cause from any ever plead in Europe or America since the great Apostacy.

Affectionately and in much esteem, yours, &c. EDITOR.

Reply to a Reformed Clergyman---No. 3.

BY S. M. M'CORKLE, A LAYMAN.

THE doctrine of the resurrection of the martyrs does not, as our friend says, "rest wholly on a figurative passage." It rests on the doctrine of Christ's second advent. Dispose of this doctrine, and the other will follow of course. Yet, the "single figurative passage," with the testimony of the four and twenty elders, and the fact that a partial resurrection did take place when Christ rose, might substantiate the doctrine. I suppose our brother will have a figurative devil, figuratively bound; and the whole scene nothing but good and bad principles in conflict; the good gaining the ascendency over the bad for a thousand years. I wonder where our brother will place his *hitherto* to the figurative meaning of scripture. What doctrine is there to be found, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation, proposed to the faith of man, that cannot be turned into a figure, stript of its worth, of its meaning, by the magic hand of spiritualizers! No scripture may be turned into a figure, but that which *must*. It is a dangerous precedent. It is giving man an unbounded latitude with the sacred oracles, to turn any thing his God may propose to his faith into a something else—a something to suit his own fruitful imagination, or his dexterity in spiritualizing, and rendering God's word ambiguous and unintelligible. The wise and learned, so called, have shed more darkness on the sacred pages than light. Who will dare to approach the word of his God, and say, that a passage must be turned into a figure, when it is perfectly intelligible in its literal meaning? The Apocalypse must be taken as a book of figures; yet we are compelled to admit a literal meaning in places, or destroy its meaning.

I cannot be persuaded that there is much difficulty in all cases to determine between the figure and that which is truly literal. From the 7th to the 19th chapter we have a succession of figures, concentrating to the same point—the dissolution of the present dispensation,

Digitized by Google

and the introduction of a *new*, all terrible with destruction on man. From the 20th to the end the whole scene is changed—altogether relative to a new era—altogether glorious—commencing with the binding of Satan, the great deceiver of man. And I very much doubt the propriety of turning this part of the book, in its general bearing, into a figure at all. In the former is developed the whole history of the christian dispensation—its corruption and its day of vengeance. Its tragical history closes in the 19th chapter; the balance of the book is evidently a new drama, in which no human blood is shed, no vials of wrath poured for a thousand years. Satan is closely identified with the present dispensation; in the next, his power is to be entirely suspended. Now, is this suspending power to be moral or physical? If you say *moral*, from whence is this new power to arise? Is there to be an increase of light and motive—a new revelation? Can you suppose a higher motive can be presented to the mind of man, than *immortality?* No doubt in the new dispensation the potency of the moral influence will arise from an unerring administration. You must bring in new lords or new laws, before you can evangelize the world—*before you can evangelize christendom!*

A resurrection of the martyrs is neither unnecessary nor improbable: short of this it will be nothing but a revival. A revival cannot be a resurrection—it is an outrage on common sense.

The subjects of the resurrection before us have had an abstract existence, not qualities; have been under the influence of motive, have willed, have acted, have incurred penalties, are proper subjects of reward, have refused to worship the *beast* or his *image*, have refused to be marked in the forehead or hand, have been martyred; and it is plainly implied in the passage that the first resurrection is their reward for having thus obeyed their God, and having suffered for the "witness of Jesus."

Now, sir, for whose meritorious obedience, suffering, and martyrdom, is the *spirits of the martyrs to be resurrected?* And these very martyrs are contrasted with "the rest of the dead"—those who have not thus obeyed—thus suffered. Man is the only object of resurrection in holy writ—not qualities. If qualities are the objects of this resurrection, what an uncertain, round-about way our God has of communicating information about the future: cannot tell whether it be the soul or body which is to be raised; or, perchance, only a *revival of religion.* What ambiguity! On a mere *perchance* is suspended the whole hope of our friend's *church revival;* not on promise at all: not a single solitary promise to renovate the Gentile church in all God's word—many promises to the outcast sons of Abraham.

Our friend says, "And if God should put his spirit into the raised christian church, as he has promised to do to the house of Israel," &c. Where is your promise, brother? It is not to be found in all the living oracles. The admission upsets half the strength of your fortress! Now, reader, read the 37th chapter of Ezekiel attentively, and if the vision of the *dry bones* does not relate fairly and truly to the literal return of the Jews to their own land again, the Layman has

Digitized by Google

made another blunder:—"I will take the children of Isral from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land," &c. And, upon our friend's theory, we may figure away every thing in the invisible world, heaven or hell—Christ's sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension. If his second advent is to be figurative, his first was, and he is to have a figurative reign—his enemies figuratively slain—thrones, judgment, resurrection, in toto—all a figure!!

The Reformed Clergyman says, "Our lay brother is eloquent on the inability of a corrupt government to renovate itself." Now, brother, give one solitary fact to the contrary, either civil or ecclesiastic. The history of Greece and of Rome, and of all other nations is on our side of the question. I repeat it again, that the Jewish church was never restored to primitive glory. It come out of Babylon stript of its diadem, shorn of its glory. The fathers in Israel who had seen the first Temple in its greatness, wept over the second for its poverty. No ark of the covenants to place in its *Sanctum Sanctorum*. On its altar no fire from heaven descended. No visible display of Heaven's approbation consumed the consecrating sacrifice. Tears bedewed the hallowed ground, and the feeble hand of a priest kindled a fire which aforetime had been kindled by the hand of Omnipotence! Is it strange that they wept when contrasting their low estate with their former greatness? I repeat it, that no dispensation since the creation has ever been renovated—they may be reformed for a while; and these reformations are short-lived, soon need reform, and finally end in dissolution. Nor has our friend proved the position false—he slips over or round them by saying, "his (the Layman's) conclusions are not, in our judgment, in his premises."

Our friend, in reasoning on the possibility of reforming the christian dispensation, says, "Let us meanwhile estimate what intellectual and moral means may do, from what they have done." And, "Will any man say that things have been growing worse ever since the Protestant Reformation?" The Protestant Reformation saved christendom from the vials of the wrath of Almighty God.

But suppose we admit the fact that reformations soon need reform, what is to save Protestants when they need reformation? Will you tell me that no reform is needed, and that the motley face of the Protestant religion is all the religion of Christ? As an impartial observer, I believe reform in the Protestant world almost as necessary as it was in the days of Luther, and far less possible. A Jewish reformation in a few centuries settled down in a sanctimonious pharisaic devotion, which could not be reformed—which would scrupulously pay tithes of "mint and annis," and crucify a looked for Messiah!

Reformations have their flows and ebbs. In a few years they are known no more but on the page of history. A reformation now in progress will probably give the last impetus, the last vigorous pulsation about the heart of corrupted Protestantism. How little pure and unadulterated christian piety is to be found even among the boasting

Digitized by Google

Protestants, *worshippers of the image of the beast.* Not a tithe of that which comes to us in the garb of Christ, will stand the test of the living oracles.

After all the rhetoric of our friend about the "ideas excogitated by Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Bacon, Locke, and Newton," renovating "half the world," with his pencil and hand I might draw a picture no less true, of christendom closely inspected; which would appear in sad contrast with our brother's "splendid triumphs of truth over ages of darkness and superstition." This is admitted; but in what has it eventuated? More than a hundred "*Lo! Heres*" twice told—all strongly contending for the faith once delivered to the saints. Error in all its shapes and forms, has its priests, its altars, its sacrifice. The plains of Shinar never presented more discordant notes, a greater confusion of tongues, than the christian religion *among Protestants!*

The Press, which our brother seems to think is "destined to tear up all sorts of error by the root," is its strongest bulwark. It forms a rampart of adamant round every error believed or propagated, since the first volumes of smoke burst upon the christian horizon from the bottomless pit. Not an error, from *the second edition of Shakerism** up to the great Mother of Harlots, without its press at its head, causing it to strike deeper its vile roots. And Presses, like so many hounds unkennelled, are in *hot chase and endless cry* after every thing like reformation, as an innovation on the faith once delivered to the saints. One right way—a thousand wrong ones—with as many iron tongues, in endless jargon, chyming their innumerable "*Lo! Heres*" —the excellency of their favorite *Diana!*

I grant the power of the Press; but, my dear sir, has it no power against truth? There must be a hundred presses against truth for every one in its favor.

Our friend says that "the Bible may be read and understood by all men," &c. I am a strong advocate for the high authority of the Bible; but why has it not converted the different sectarians to the true religion of Christ? Nine-tenths of the religionists of the age are unconverted Bible readers. How is it to have greater facilities in making converts among the heathen than it has among professed christians?

The Reformed Clergyman, in his "moral means and physical means combined, the proposition and the proof, the doctrine and the miracle, the denunciation and the plague," has well nigh staggered on *the two witnesses*, if the Layman's theory about them be correct. Now this moral and physical hand of the Lord, which existed in the Jewish church while pure, which did attend christianity in its uncorrupt age, (the Lord bearing them witness with signs and wonders,) the two witnesses, be they what they may, are to finish their testimony. Suppose your moral and physical means combined should prove to be the Two Witnesses, and you cannot prove the contrary: suppose they finish their testimony—cease to operate combinedly;

* Mormonism.

Digitized by Google

how will you get along without them? And that the moral witness is not to accompany the physical, is most likely; for in some certain cases where the physical hand had been performing its office in severe judgments, they "repented not of their deeds." Judgments which have fallen on the world for a few years past, sore as they have been, in but a few instances have they made men better.

Suppose we examine how your moral and physical means combined agrees with the Apocalypse. Amidst all the vials of wrath, all the plagues recorded in the mysterious book, not a solitary instance of men being made better; but the reverse. "They blasphemed the God of heaven, because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds."

The Two Witnesses, the moral and physical means, attended the Jewish dispensation until its measure of iniquity was full. The moral witness then withdrew, and left the physical hand to accomplish its dreadful work of death upon the devoted people. So will it be again under the vials of the wrath of Almighty God. The judgments under which Mystery Babylon is to fall, are to have no mercies mingled with them; and how much better is that part of christendom to fare *who are worshipping the beast?* Not a ray of hope can I see for our friend's moral and physical means combined renovating the world or the dispensation, until the fierce indignation be overpast.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Mr. Meredith---Waning.

THE full moon face with which our friend Mr. *Meredith*, of North Carolina, looked on us, is now gibbous and fast waning into the last quarter. It seems we erred in representing him so magnanimous as to give us line for line and page for page on certain propositions. He proves he intended no such thing; and for a little over one column in his paper, of *long primer*, afforded our No. 1, he has given two columns and a half of *long primer*, mixed with *brevier*, to himself—in part to prove that he intended no such thing.

"To cut the matter short," says he, (and I will not cut it long by reprinting a column of *brevier* of the correspondence between him and Messrs. Erwins and Robert, unconnected with our argument as the amours of Henry VIII. is with the truth of the Protestant religion—"To cut the matter short, however, we will now say," [some time in March, 1834,]—"although entirely contrary to our plan, and without the least sense of obligation on our part—if Mr. Campbell conscientiously believes that justice to himself, and the interest of his cause, require that he should be heard in the Interpreter—he shall be gratified. On this subject we have but one fear—that of devoting too much of our paper to useless debate. Be it known to all whom it may concern, that, touching the proposition referred to by our call, Mr. Campbell shall have 'line for line and page for page with us' in our columns. More than this we promise not."

Digitized by Google

It was, then, only "*touching the proposition referred to*," that single proposition, that I was to be thus favored. So interprets his "Interpreter," volume 2, page 36. I will not, therefore, dispute it. He best knows what he meant to say. I say, then, to save words and time, grant that he is not so magnanimous, and impartial, as we supposed. We proceed to notice that he has moreover said, "Beyond the engagement already made we are as yet unauthorized to proceed." I am not, then, authorized to fill my pages with detailed excuses for non-complianee with the anticipated conditions. Nevertheless, that our readers and Mr. Meredith may have all justice done them, we shall give his remarks *in extenso* upon our No. 1, which our readers will please find in the February, No. 7:—

"Mr. Campbell must excuse the non-publication of his numbers, *unless they come more within the scope of our promise*;—unless, in other words, they bear more directly upon the points at issue. Our principle objections to the present essay are the following:

1. *It does not begin at the right place.* Entirely inverting the order of discussion and of reason—passing over the examination *in toto*—giving neither an *argument* nor an *illustration* of any kind—the author fixes upon a few *concluding remarks* in our *last number*—presents his readers with a *synopsis* of propositions which had been considered at length in the body of the examination—and then calls on us for proof; just as if we had convicted ourselves of the weakness of attempting to maintain our positions without evidence! Surely Mr. Campbell must have known that this is not the manner in which we treated him. And he certainly ought to have known that this is not the way in which candor, good sense, and the laws of argument require that he should treat us. Let him stand up to us as we have stood up to him; let him state our positions as we have stated his; let him give our arguments and our evidence as we have given his; and our word for it, we shall make no complaint on *this score*.

2. *It does not touch the subject at issue.* The facts of the case are these:—Mr. Campbell set forth his views in two Extras—we, in our examination, called these views in question—Mr. Campbell claimed the privilege of self-defence in our columns. This privilege, so far as it respects his first and main proposition, we have granted; but now, instead of engaging in behalf of the proposition in question, or indeed of any proposition whatever, Mr. Campbell comes out with an essay of strictures on *our views!!* What, we would ask, have our views of theology to do with the Extras—with the author's defence—or with any point that can have the least possible bearing on the question in hand? Suppose our positions wrong—all wrong—totally wrong—this cannot prove Mr. Campbell right; nor can it contribute in any manner or degree to the support of the Extras, or any one of the doctrines they set forth. All this is too obvious to need further remark.

3. *It involves a mode of controversy which can lead to no profitable result*, if indeed it can lead to any result at all. It seems to us to resemble too much the plan of attack of those, who, taking their position

Digitized by Google

at a distance from the enemy, rely for success on the length of their guns, and the strength of their powder. By such method much noise and smoke may be produced, and much time and labor may be wasted; but it is not the way to do execution. As for ourselves, we are fond of close quarters; we prefer the use of small arms; we like to grapple with the foe; that the onset may be short and decisive as possible. We must therefore insist that, if Mr. Campbell is to appear in our columns, he must throw away his guns and draw his sword; in other words, he must stand up to his first proposition, and from that point he must not move, until the question respecting it is settled. The reasonableness and necessity of this demand are so obvious, as to commend themselves to the understanding of every person in the least acquainted with the rules of debate.

Notwithstanding the above objections, we have published the present essay, because it furnishes us with an opportunity for making such statements and explanations as the occasion seems to demand. And having laid it before our readers, we consider it due to ourselves, as well as to Mr. Campbell, to notice briefly its details.

1. For the accuracy of our statements respecting the doctrines of the Extras, we refer the readers of the Harbinger to the *Examination* —to the fourteen numbers in the Interpreter—where they will find the propositions of the author, as stated and illustrated by himself, examined and compared in detail.

2. Respecting the agreement which Mr. Campbell declares to exist between his sentiments and ours, we are certainly bound to take his word, *whatever may be the fate of the Extras*; and, such being the case, it is an occasion of unfeigned gratification to us, to find our theology so generally and so cordially approved. We have only to add, that the sentiments in question, with one or two trivial exceptions, perhaps, are and have been generally maintained by Baptists, both in this country and in Europe. Under such circumstances, we cannot help regarding the author's efforts at reformation in the Baptist denomination, as unnecessary as they have been ill-advised and unfortunate.

3. Respecting Mr. Campbell's objection to our definition of conversion, we have only to say, that there is no room for debate. He assents, he says, to our definition, but objects to the *philosophy* of one of its *adjuncts* But surely he cannot believe it necessary, nor even expedient, to debate about philosophical speculations where there is a cordial agreement as to the *theology* involved. Surely our readers will think that we have but little to do, when we so far forget ourselves and our duty, as to occupy their attention with a controversy about points in philosophy. We have only to add here, had Mr. Campbell examined us as closely as we have examined him, he would have found our philosophy, in the present case, fully as sound as our theology. For further information, we refer the reader to the 12th and 13th numbers of our Examination.

4. To our proposition respecting Regeneration, Mr. Campbell has

Digitized by Google

three objections;—it wants proof—it is inaccurate in language—it is unphilosophical.

For the *first* we refer the readers of the Harbinger to the 7th number of the Examination, where this subject has been considered at large. When it shall be shown that the arguments there adduced are inconclusive, it will be time enough, it strikes us, to demand more proof.

On Mr. Campbell's *second* objection—"it is inaccurate in language"—it is sufficient to observe, that we have neither the time nor the inclination to debate about *words*. It can surely be a matter of but little importance to our readers, or to Mr. Campbell's, whether we call faith and repentance *affections*, or whether we invent some other term. This much, however, we will say, if Mr. Campbell can find a better, a more appropriate expression, we shall have not the least objection to exchange ours for his. In the mean time we shall take the liberty to adhere to our former vocabulary. We only add, had we thought it worth our while to stop for verbal criticisms, in the examination of the Extras, the work would probably have been unfinished yet.

For the *third* difficulty—"it is unphilosophical"—we have about as little concern as we have for the last. If the readers of the Harbinger shall find our propositions to be according to the *Scriptures*, it will make but little difference with them, we presume, whether or not they exactly correspond with the language of the *schools*. Books of rhetoric and philosophy furnish but poor authority for the settlement of questions like the present. We have not the least objection, however, to submit the definition in question, at the proper time, to either or to both the tests appealed to by Mr. Campbell. Our present conviction is, that our philosophy, in the case in hand, is as sound as our theology; and that both are amply sustained in what we have written on the subject. Be this, however, as it may, it will evidently be quite in season, when Mr. Campbell shall come to consider our Essays on Repentance and Regeneration, for us to meet the difficulties which they may be supposed to present. In the mean time we confidently refer the reader to the fifth and seventh numbers of the Examination.

5. Mr. Campbell concludes by saying that he would not impose a heavy burden at first. This is certainly very considerate and very benevolent; for which he is entitled to our most humble and grateful thanks. We shall undoubtedly bear it in mind, and shall endeavor to treat him, in return, with similar *forbearance*.

The above is all we have to say in relation to Mr. Campbell's first essay. To prevent all misapprehension for the future, we now wish it distinctly understood that we are prepared to fulfil our engagement in the widest sense which our words will admit—*to give Mr. Campbell line for line with ourselves, touching the first proposition*, namely—"That the facts of the Scriptures do delineate the image of God on the soul," &c. &c. When the question touching this proposition shall be settled, it will be time enough to make arrangements for future

Digitized by Google

operations. Our present impression is, that, provided Mr. Campbell shall comply with our terms respecting his first proposition, we shall consider ourselves at liberty to grant him similar terms, concerning a second, a third, and so on to the end of the chapter. All this, however, we choose to leave, for the present, with our own discretion. Beyond the offer already made, we as yet engage nothing. In the mean time, it is understood that Mr. Campbell shall publish as much for us as we publish for him; and that he shall begin by giving place to our present remarks.

We insist upon Mr. Campbell's commencing with the defence of his first position for obvious reasons: It is first in the order of time—it is first in the order of discussion—it is first in importance—it lies at the foundation of the controversy—on the issue respecting this will depend the issue respecting every other proposition in the Extras. On this point we are therefore positive and inflexible.

We conclude by saying that Mr. Campbell is undoubtedly entitled to our thanks for the patience with which he has borne our long examination, and the respectful manner in which he has been pleased to notice it. We are gratified not a little on account of his obvious conviction, that we have treated him with the candor, the civility, and the respect, due from one gentleman to another. We can assure him, that we have not a sentiment nor a feeling that would prompt us to do otherwise. We cordially respect the magnanimity which he has shown on the occasion, and should sincerely regret the existence of a circumstance, which might mar the good feeling which manifestly subsists between us. EDITOR."

Thus we have published more for Mr. Meredith than he has done for us, and would gladly have been still more generous had he met us with that manly candor and unquibbling frankness which we think conscious truth and conscious strength warrant.

But, courteous reader, mark what follows. Mr. Meredith, "in the *widest range*" which "his words will admit," is willing to meet his engagements, and to give "Mr. Campbell line for line with ourselves, touching his first proposition; namely, 'That the facts of the Scripture do delineate the image of God upon the soul," &c. &c. Stop, reader! read this over again. Mark the inverted commas; they are Mr. Meredith's, be assured. Now be it known to you, it is a *forgery:* I never published such a proposition. I never affirmed such a position in word or writing!!! *O Tempora! O Mores!* This is *my* first proposition!! In the discussion of this, I am to have line for line, &c.!! That is, in Virginia English, 'If I will allow Mr. MEREDITH to MAKE my first proposition for me, and my second and third, I suppose he will allow me line for line,' &c. Have I mistaken my man? or has he been so long habituated to forging propositions for me, that he has once, in a former number, *italicised* a proposition for me, and here quoted a part of, with the usual evidences of honest quotation, and did not remember that it was a *genuine* counterfeit! In his second number of the Interpreter, page 33, he prints in *italics*, "for the sake

Digitized by Google

of perspicuity"—! this proposition: "*The system of facts announced in the gospel, when apprehended by the natural mind, do, of themselves, delineate the image of God upon the human soul; and it is by the operation of these facts, thus acting on the understanding and the heart, that sinners are created anew and formed for the glory of God.*" This he calls my first proposition. As *truly* might a Methodist call his Discipline, the Presbyterian his Creed, the Baptist his Church Covenant *the Bible.* The Westminster Confession of Faith is as truly the Bible, as the above proposition is either my words or my ideas.

Speaking of the gospel facts, the following is my proposition in my own words:—"These are the seal which *testimony* conveys to the understanding, and faith brings to the heart of sinners, by which God creates them anew, and forms them for his glory."* Compare these words of mine with Mr. Meredith's: "*Do of* THEMSELVES delineate the image of God," &c. and then, pious reader, will you not say with me, Alas! for this generation, when thus act the leaders of the people! No wonder this gentleman recedes from the defence of his theory of metaphysical regeneration; and makes the first proposition for *me*, which, by the aid of popular prejudice, he can use as a cloud of dust to blind his readers. He does not know how much he yet owes to my mercy, in suffering him to play such pranks without exposure, for the long series of fourteen numbers of his Interpreter.

I would be sorry to think that any of my readers would require me to show how he has defended his theory in his elaborate reply to my No. 1. The person so obtuse as not to see that his theory is so blown to atoms that he has not himself courage to gather the broken pieces, and attempt to tack them together, is not worth an effort, if after reading my No. 1, and his defence.

I cannot but commend his policy in making a proposition for me at which to commence line for line, &c.

Now, Mr. Meredith, if you are not in your own soul ashamed of your course, admit me into your columns upon the same honorable and high-minded terms I admit you into my pages; and if you are unwilling to defend your own propositions, accept one from me, embracing my real views and sentiments, in my own language, without note or comment, or interpolation of your own. When I want an interpreter or an amanuensis, I will select one for myself. I have no objection to begin with this proposition, which you have metamorphosed and called my first:—

'Revealed religion is founded on *facts*, (not opinions or theories.) *The gospel facts are the moral seal which testimony conveys to the understanding and faith brings to the heart of sinners, by which God creates them anew, and forms them for his glory.*'

Assail now as I have printed it; give me page for page and line for line, like an honorable man: and if I do not treat you as a gentleman and a christian ought to treat a fellow-citizen, then publish me to the ends of North Carolina. EDITOR.

* Extra on Regeneration, page 141, under the word FACT. Also, Christianity Restored, page 108.

Digitized by Google

Evidences of the Gospel---No. 2.

THE proposition that *'there is a God,'* being once suggested, the universe, with its ten thousand tongues, addressed to the ear of reason, and its ten thousand times ten thousand designs submitted to the eye of reflection, is demonstration clear, full, and overwhelming.

To the unperverted vision of a sound mind, material nature is but one vast assemblage of systems of adaptations, working out innumerable series of results, in harmonious subordination to one grand end, exhibiting nothing so clearly as the wonderful contrivance and intelligent designs of one vast and unsearchable mind.

It must, indeed, be confessed that as the natural eye may be so dimmed and jaundiced by a disturbed digestion, as not to see objects in their true color and proper position; so may the mental sight be so vitiated by a diseased heart, as not to see even design itself in the wisest and most palpable arrangements of means to ends, with which the whole kingdom of nature abounds. Hence, in a land of Bibles, and in accordance with the true doctrine of causation, the moral atheist necessarily precedes the speculative atheist: for with David we must say, *"It is in his heart"* the fool first says, "There is no God." Atheism must, therefore, be always regarded as a disease of the heart.

The fogs and mists that hide the sun from our vision, the darkest clouds that overspread the heavens, rise from the earth. Above these exhalations the sun shines in uniform and undiminished brightness. Now if nature's immortal and eternal Sun illumines not our mental eyes, analogy confirms as well as illustrates the fact, that the cause is from beneath. He who, with right affections, sets about the contemplation of the universe, will not be long held in suspense whether it is the work of blind chance or of intelligent design. Such a person will soon discover that atheism is the greatest of human follies, and the most mischievous of all delusions.

It is the greatest of human follies, for two reasons: First, because it is impossible to prove that there is no God; and in the second place, it is impossible for the atheist to prove from his premises that there is any mind in man. He that says there is no God, must say there is no mind; and he that doubts the being of God, must also doubt the being of mind.

We have said it is impossible to prove that there is no God. The reason is obvious: for could a person with the lamp of universal science traverse the solar system, and prosecute his inquiries for ten thousand years, it must be conceded that even then there would remain mysteries uncomprehended, arcana unexplored, latent and remote causes undiscovered. If, however, but one unknown cause remained, he could not conclude that there is no God, inasmuch as that very cause, to him unascertained, might be the great First Cause. To prove that there is no God is, therefore, the greatest of impossibilities. Is he not, then, a fool, who says there is no God?

Digitized by Google

What, in the next place, let me ask, is the proof—what the demonstration of mind? Its only evidence, and it is an infallible one, is its designs, its contrivance;—the adaptation of means to ends, working and making arrangements with a reference to final causes or results. This is what distinguishes the sane from the insane—the man from the idiot. Now, none of the works of human art exhibit more intelligent design than the works of nature; nay, indeed, none of them exhibit so much. It is conceded, and very generally, that there are the most striking appearances of purpose and design in all the works of nature. Now, if, as it is universally conceded, intelligent contrivance, purpose, and design are the only evidences of mind in the works of human art, it must follow that the same appearances in nature must prove a mind independent of nature, controlling, managing, and working by nature its own results—whatever proves mind in the one case proves it in the other; and if the appearance of design in the works of God will not prove his existence, neither will the appearances of mind in the works of men prove the existence of mind in man. The atheist, therefore, if he presume to be consistent, must not only affirm that there is no God, but also that there is no mind in man.

It is scarcely necessary to designate instances in the works of nature, in which there is an appearance of purpose; for every thing has this appearance. I will, however, mention several cases as samples.

"1. The adaptation of the covering of animals to the climates in which they live. Northern animals have thicker and warmer coats of fur or hair, than southern ones. And here it should be remarked, that man, the only creature capable of clothing himself, is the only one that is not clothed by nature. Singular discrimination and care, indeed, for non-intelligence!

2. The adaptation of animals to the elements in which they live—the fish to the water, other animals to the air. Would not an unintelligent Energy or Power (for a *Power* all must acknowledge) be as likely to form the organs of a fish for air as for water!

3. The necessity which man has for sustenance, &c. and the supply of that necessity by nature. Here let it be noted how many things must act in unison, to produce the necessary result. The earth must nourish the seed, the sun must warm it, the rain must moisten it, and man must have the strength to cultivate it,—and the organs to eat it, and the stomach to digest it, and the blood vessels to circulate it, and so on. Is it credible, that all these things should *happen* without design?

4. The *pre*-adaptation of the infant to the state of things into which it enters at birth. The eye is exactly suited to the light, the ear to sound, the nose to smell, the palate to taste, the lungs to the air, &c. &c. &c. How is it possible to see no design in this *pre*-adaptation, so curious, so complicated, and in so many particulars!

5. The milk of animals, suitable for the nourishment of their young; provided just in season; provided without contrivance on the part of the parent;—and sought for without instruction or experience on the part of its offspring!—and all by chance!!!

6. The different sexes. In this case, as in the rest, there is perfect adaptation, which displays evident design. And there is more. What, I ask, is there in nature to cause a difference in the sexes? Why are not all, either males or females?—or rather a compound? This case, then, I consider not only an evidence of design, but likewise an evidence of the special and continual *volution* of the Creator. * * * *

Digitized by Google

7. The destitution of horns on the calf, and of teeth in the suckling. All other parts are perfect at the very first; but were calves and sucklings to have teeth and horns, what sore annoyances would these appendages prove to their dams and dames. How is it, that all the necessary parts of the young are thus perfect at the first, and their annoying parts unformed till circumstances render them *no* annoyance—unformed at the time they are not needed, and produced when they are, for defence and mastication? Who can fail of discerning intelligence here?

8. The teats of animals. These bear a general proportion to the number of young which they are wont to have at a time. Those that have few young have few of these appurtenances; those that have many, many. Were these animals to make preparations themselves in this respect, how could things be more appropriate!

9. The pea and the bean. The pea-vine, unable to stand erect of itself, has tendrils with which to cling to a supporter; but the bean-stalk, self-sustained, has nothing of the kind.

10. The pumpkin. This does not grow on the oak, to fall on the *tender* head of the wiseacre who reposes in its shade, *reasoning* that it should grow there rather than where it does, because forsooth the oak would be able to sustain it. And were he to undertake to set the other works of Providence to rights which he now considers wrong, 'tis a chance if he would not get many a thump upon his pate, ere he should get the universe arranged to his mind. And if, before completing his undertaking, he should not find it the easier of the two to arrange his mind to the universe, it would be because *what little* brains he *has* would get thumped out of his cranium altogether!

11. The great energies of nature. To suppose the existence of *powers* as the cause of the operations of nature—powers destitute of life, and, at the same time, self-moving, and acting upon matter without the intervention of extrinsic agency; is just as irrational as to suppose such a power in a machine, and is a gross absurdity, and a self-contradiction. But to suppose that these lifeless energies, even if possessed of such qualities, could, void of intelligence, produce *such* effects as *are* produced in the universe, requires credulity capable of believing any thing.

12. The whole universe, whether considered in its elementary, or its organized state. From the simple grass to the tender plant, and onward to the sturdy oak; from the least insect up to man; there is skill the most consummate, design the most clear. What substance, useless as it may be when uncompounded with other substances, does not manifest design in its affinity to those substances, by a union with which it is rendered useful? What plant, what shrub, what tree, has not organization and arrangement the most perfect imaginable? What insect so minute that contains not, within its almost invisible exterior, adjustment of part to part in the most exact order throughout all its complicated system, infinitely transcending the most ingenious productions of art; and the most appropriate adaptation of all those parts to its peculiar mode of existence? Rising in the scale of sensitive being, let us consider the beast of the forest, in whose case, without microscopic aid, we have the subject more accessible. Is he a beast of prey? Has the God of nature given him an instinctive thirst for blood? Behold, then, his sharp-sighted organs of vision for descrying his victim afar, his agile limbs for pursuit, his curved and pointed claws for seizing and tearing his prey, his sharp-edged teeth for cutting through its flesh, his firm jaws for griping, crushing, and devouring it, and his intestines for digesting raw flesh! But is he a graminivorous animal? Does he subsist on grass and herb? Behold, then, his clumsy limbs and his clawless hoofs, his blunt teeth and his herb-digesting stomach! So perfect is the correspondence between one part and another; so exactly adapted are all the parts to the same general objects; so wonderful is the harmony, and so definite and invariable the purpose, obtaining throughout the whole, that it is necessary to see but a footstep, or even a bone, to be able to decide the nature and construction of the animal that imprinted that footstep, or that possessed that

Digitized by Google

bone! Ascending still higher in the scale, we come at last to man—man, the highest, noblest workmanship of God on earth, the lord of this sphere terrene, for whose behoof all mundane things exist. In common with all other animals, he has that perfect adaptation of part to part, and of all the parts to general objects, which demonstrate consummate wisdom in the Cause which thus adapted them. His eyes are so placed as to look the same way in which his feet are placed to walk, and his hands to toil. His feet correspond with each other, being both placed to walk in the same direction, and with their corresponding sides towards one another, without which he would hobble, even if he could walk at all. His mouth is placed in the forepart of the head, by which it can receive food and drink from the hands. But the hands themselves—who can but admire their wonderful utility? To what purpose are they not adapted? Man, who has many ends to accomplish, in common with the beast of the field; who has hunger to alleviate, thirst to slake, &c. &c. the same as the former, has likewise other and higher ends, for the attainment of which he is peculiarly qualified by means of *hands*. Adapted by his constitution to inhabit all climes, he has hands to adapt his clothing to the same, whether torrid, temperate, or frigid. Possessed of the knowledge of the utility of the soil, he has hands to cultivate it. Located far distant ofttimes from the running stream, these hands enable him to disembowel the earth, and there find an abundant supply of the all-necessary fluid. Endued with rational ideas, pen in *hand* he can transmit them to his fellow far away, or to generations unborn. Heir and lord of earth and ocean, his hands enable him to possess and control the same; without which, notwithstanding all his reason, he could do neither, but would have to crouch beneath the superior strength of the brute, and fly for shelter to crags inaccessible to his beastly sovereign. But useful after all as are these appendages, how very like the paws of beasts in this respect would they become, were man devoid of reason. Thus we see, that the only creature that has the reason to manage the world, has the physical organization to do it. No *beast* with man's reason could do this; and no *man* with the mere instinct of a brute could do it. How marvellous then this adaptation! Yea, how wondrous the adaptation of every thing. And how astonishing that any man, with all these things in view, can for one moment forbear to admit a God. Let him try *a chance experiment*. Let him take the letters of the alphabet, and throw them about promiscuously; and then see how long ere they would move of their own accord, and arrange themselves into words and sentences. Yea, he may avail himself of the whole benefit of his scheme; he may have the advantage of an Energy or power as a momentum, to set them in motion. He may put these letters into a box sufficiently large for the purpose, and then shake them as long as may seem him good; and when, in this way, they shall have become intelligible language, I will admit that he will have some reason for doubting a God. Nay, more. If this should seem too much like *artificial* mind, he may take some little animal, all constructed at his hands, and dismember its limbs, and dissect its body; and then within some vessel let him throw its various parts at random, and, seizing that vessel, shake it most lustily, till bone shall come to bone, joint to joint, and the little creature be restored to its original form. But if this could not be accomplished by mere power, without wisdom to direct, how could the original adjustment occur by chance? Nay, how could those very parts themselves be *formed for* adjustment one to another? Mathematicians tell us wondrous things in relation to these hap-hazard concerns. And they demonstrate their statements by what will not lie—figures. Their rule is this: that, as one thing admits of but one position, as for example, *a*, so two things, *a* and *b*, are capable of two positions, as *ab*, *ba*. But if a third be added, instead of their being susceptible of only one additional position, or three in all, they are capable of six. For example, abc, acb, bac, bca, cab, cba. Add another letter, *d*, and the four are capable of twenty-four positions, or variations, thus: abcd, acbd, adbc, adcb, acdb, bacd, bcad, bdac, bdca, bcda, badc, cabd, cbad, cdab, dbac, cbda, cadb, dabc, dbac, dcab, dcba, dbca, dacb. Thus, we might go on.

Digitized by Google

Merely adding another letter, *e*, and so making *five* instead of four, would increase the number of variations *five*-fold. They would then amount to one hundred and twenty. A single additional letter, *f*, making *six* in all, would increase this last sum of one hundred and twenty, *six*-fold, and would accordingly raise it to the amount of seven hundred and twenty. Add a *seventh* letter, *g*, and the last named sum would be increased *seven*-fold, and thereby be raised to the number of five thousand and forty. An *eighth* letter, *h*, would increase said five thousand and forty, *eight*-fold, thus raising it to the sum of forty thousand, three hundred and twenty. A *ninth* letter, *i*, would increase the latter sum *nine*-fold, and so on to the end of the alphabet; when we should have the astonishing result, that, with only the twenty-six letters thereof, the different changes or variations which can be made with them, or the different positions in which they can be placed, amount to the immense number of six hundred and twenty thousand, four hundred and forty-eight trillions; four hundred and one thousand, seven hundred and thirty-three billions; two hundred and thirty-nine thousand, four hundred and thirty-nine millions; and three hundred and sixty thousand!!! Hence it follows, that, were the letters of the alphabet to be thrown promiscuously into a vessel, to be afterwards shaken into order by mere hap, their chance of being arranged, not to say into words and sentences, but into their alphabetical arrangement, would be only as 1 to 620448401733239439360000. All this, too, in the case of only twenty-six letters! Take now the human frame, with its innumerable bones, tendons, nerves, muscles, veins, arteries, ducts, glands, cartilages, &c. &c. &c. and, having dissected the same, throw those parts into one promiscuous mass; and how long, I ask, would it be, ere Chance would put them all into their appropriate places, and form a perfect man? In this calculation, we are likewise to take into the account the chances of their being placed bottom upwards, or sideways, or wrongside out, notwithstanding they might merely find their appropriate places. This would increase the chances against a well-formed system, to an amount beyond all calculation or conception. In the case of the alphabet, the chances for the letters to fall bottom up, or aslant, are not included. And when we reflect, that the blind goddess would have to contend against such fearful odds in the case of a single individual, how long are we to suppose it would be, ere from old Chaos she could shake this mighty universe, with all its myriads upon myriads of existences, into the glorious order and beauty in which it now exists!

An atheistic naturalist's a fool.

He can't believe that two letters can be adjusted to each other without design; and yet he can believe all the foregoing incredibilities.

I might swell the list to a vast extent. I might bring into view the verdure of the earth, as being the most agreeable of all colors to the eye; the general diffusion of the indispensables and necessaries of life, such as air, light, water, food, clothing, fuel, &c. while less necessary things, such as wines, spices, gold, silver, &c. are less diffused;—also, the infinite variety in things, in men for instance, by which we can distinguish one from another, &c. &c. &c. But I forbear. If the cases adduced do not prove design, what *can* prove it? How *could* design be more apparent than in these instances? And is it reasonable to conclude, that, where there are all possible appearances of design, still no design is there? or even that it is probable there is none?

I have said, that there is as much evidence of purpose in the works of nature, as in those of art. I now say that there is more, *infinitely* more. Nay, should the wheels of Nature stop their revolutions, and her energies be palsied, and life and motion cease, even then would she exhibit incomparably greater evidence of design, in her mere construction and adaptation, than do the works of art. Shall we then be told, that when she is in full operation, and daily producing millions upon millions of useful, of intelligent, of marvellous effects, she still manifests no marks of intelligence! In nature, we not only see all the works of art infinitely exceeded, but we see, as it were, those works

Digitized by Google

self-moved, and performing their operations without external agency. To use a faint comparison, we see a factory in motion without water, wind or steam, its cotton placing itself within the reach of the picker, the cards, the spinning-frame and the loom, and turning out in rolls of cloth. Such virtually, nay, far more wonderful, is the universe. Not a thousandth part so unreasonable would it be, to believe a real factory of this description, were one to exist, to be a chance existence, as to believe this same universe so. Sooner could I suppose Nature herself possessed of intelligence, than admit the idea, that there is *no* intelligence concerned in her organization and operations. There must be a mind within or without her, or else we have no data by which to distinguish mind. There must be a mind, or all the results of mind are produced without any. There must be a mind, or chaos produces order, blind power perfects effects, and non-intelligence the most admirable correspondence and harmony imaginable. Sceptics pride themselves much on their reason. They can't believe, they say, because it is unreasonable. *What* is unreasonable! to believe in a mind where there is every appearance thereof that can be? Is it more reasonable, then, to believe, that every appearance of mind is produced without any mind at all? Sceptics are the last men in all this wide world to pretend to reason. They doubt against infinite odds; they believe without evidence, against evidence, against demonstration—and then talk of reason!"

The Bridgewater Treatises have placed this matter of design in a most irresistible light. No person of common sense and of a common understanding of the meaning of words, can read *Bell* on the Hand, *Whewell* on Astronomy and General Physics, *Kidd* on the Physical Condition of Man, *Prout* on Chemistry, Meteorology, and the function of Digestion, *Chalmers* on the adaptation of External Nature to the Moral and Physical Constitution of Man—and not *feel* that all the science of the world only developes the contrivances and intelligent designs of Nature. To save the labor of arrangement we have grouped the above items from Origen Bachelor's correspondence with R. D. Owen, a work of very considerable merit.

EDITOR.

S. M. M'Corkle and the Prophecies.

Mr. Editor,

OUR good brother *M'Corkle* seems resolved to give us a second edition, without much enlargement or amendment, of his speculations on the Clergy and the Apocalypse. Is it your desire, sir, and that of your readers, that we should follow each other in a series of volumes, year by year continually, till we have told the same story so often, and in so many ways, that the dullest of your readers shall be able to repeat it off hand to every one they meet? In my weakness I had imagined that he would have made some point, and drawn out his forces upon that one point till it was satisfactorily disposed of; and thus, in close combat and in alternate replication, we would have soon exhausted our resources and satisfied the public; but in this skirmishing and long shot mode of attack and defence, husbanding our ammunition and resources, in seven years nothing could be settled.

Digitized by Google

What, for instance, is proved or disproved in his late Nos. 1 and 2? In No. 1 he tells us that "the wretched trash, inconsistencies, and absurdities palmed on the credulity of the world by the clergy and commentators as the meaning of prophecy, has contributed no little toward making the Layman dogmatical." This is fully illustrated in the new series—it was, indeed, too well illustrated in the former series. But I cannot see the philosophy of this dogmatism. If he had said "the wretched trash" had made him modest and unassuming, I could have seen some logical connexion between his premises and conclusion; but the very opposite conclusion is, with him, the most logical. Does he mean that lay dogmatism is the true and proper refutation of clerical dogmatism; or that the true and legitimate refutation of clerical dogmatism will be found in the superlative degree of *lay* dogmatism? I am, indeed, reluctantly compelled to the conclusion that so reasons the Layman.

I will not tire your readers, Mr. Editor, with an essay on our friend M'Corkle's No. 1. There is nothing in it save the reprobation of the clergy, and an attempt to mend the argument about the dispensations and analogies. The argument from dispensations of two thousand years is mended by telling us that the first ended with the Deluge, Anno Mundi 1656; and as proof of this, Moses is quoted, saying, "God said to Noah, The *end of all flesh* is come before me," &c. So that the *end of all flesh* and the *end of a dispensation* are things synonymous!! The chasm between the first and second dispensation is, therefore, only nine hundred and fifty years!! The Jewish did not begin till nearly one thousand years after the Flood. But what signifies one thousand years in the completion of a theory!

And that the Jewish dispensation was typical, temporary, and confined to one nation, the Layman dares not dispute. The wickedness and apostacy of the people under it is one thing, and the nature of the dispensation is another, unhappily confounded in the theory of two dispensations of two thousand years. As to the date of the Jewish dispensation, I do certainly, with Paul, make it originate with Moses. "Death reigned *from Adam to Moses*"—during the first dispensation: "The law was given by Moses," but the grace and the reality came by Jesus the Messiah. The first dispensation, or patriarchal, lasted from Adam to Moses, an interval of two thousand five hundred years; the second, from Moses to the coronation of Christ, a period of one thousand five hundred and thirty years. The covenant of circumcision was but the preface to the law, as was the ministry of John to the christian institution. John's ministry, nor Christ's personal ministry in Judea, was counted in the times of the third dispensation; neither was the covenant of circumcision, nor the ministry of Moses in Egypt, counted in the second dispensation. But all this is but a trifle.

I wish your correspondent, Mr. Editor, to make some point other than the clergy and the commentators—(he has done them ample honor)—and let that point be a radical one; and then let him give us his arguments and illustrations numerically, that we may consider

them. It is high time that both dogmatism and declamation be substituted by scriptural arguments and proofs.

1. Is there both a literal and a figurative coming of the Lord; or only a literal coming spoken of in the New Testament? Let us decide this point.

2. Is there a literal resurrection of all the saints one thousand years before the resurrection of the wicked?

3. Are we to expect the Messiah and the raised saints to live one thousand years on this earth before the resurrection of the wicked?

4. Are the Jews to be converted by sight?

5. Does the Lord coming in a cloud refer to the close of time, or to some period a thousand years before the close of time?

Take some one of these points and labor it fully, or some other point as fundamental as these, and I will reply or concede to the Layman. But this everlasting declamation and dogmatism—this brandishing of the sword without striking a blow, I cannot endure.

I observe, brother Editor, your fellow-laborers of the editorial corps are fond of riding upon the clouds and of soaring to the high regions of speculation on the subject of prophecy. I have not seen in them all one original idea on the subject of prophecy. In all their speculations they are following in the wake of some adventurous sailor, who, like Captain Symmes, was seeking for some opening into the hollow dishes which compose our earth. I do not incline to think that Messrs. Elias Smith or Elhanan Winchester are *Daniels*, to whom God has granted peculiar insight into the visions of the future.

I am, however, willing to hear them all, if they do not preach me asleep by their monthly lectures of gigantic verbosity. Let them preach to one point at a time, and not to all points in one sermon. Do inform us, Mr. Editor, if I must wait nine months on our lay brother M'Corkle, till he have new-soldered and varnished his twelve months conceptions on the Apocalypse. If you have the patience of Job, and the Layman the perseverance of Paul, I pray you to bear with our infirmities and have compassion on our weaknesses, and give us a little new light, or snuff some of the old lights, that our eyes may be gladdened as a reward for our patience and attention.

In all consideration and esteem,

A REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

☞ We think that the edification of our readers requires an arrangement such as that suggested by the *Reformed Clergyman*. Indeed, something of this sort was suggested in a former number. After finishing the essay on hand, we shall wait for an essay on some one point from our brother M'Corkle. We shall limit them to "alternate replication," in numbers, not exceeding from five to six pages.

EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

John's Immersion.

IT is a remarkable fact, which no one of the numerous sects of the present day seems to have apprehended properly, that God in endeavoring to reconcile rebellious people to himself, whether they were the children of the promise, the seed of the father of the faithful, or the Gentile world, has in every case led the rebels through water. Such was the case with Moses—with John and the great Apostle of our redemption and High Priest of our profession—the subjects of each dispensation were obliged to pass through water, and each one of these Missionaries of Heaven led those who obeyed their word through the same ordeal of water—immersion. Thus Paul says, "I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that our fathers were all under *the* cloud, and all passed through the sea; and all were immersed into Moses, in the cloud and in the sea." Here a whole nation was immersed into Moses—the first great missionary of God to the seed of Abraham. The second divinely attested minister was John the Immerser. He came publishing the *immersion* of reformation for the remission of sins. The last proclaimer of a new order of things was "the constituted Lord of all things, through whom the universe was made." He ordained salvation for all who should believe and be *immersed*. Thus we find a gradual development of the will of God in relation to this ordinance, from Moses up to its fulness exhibited by Jesus Christ. The Jewish nation followed Moses, and was immersed into him. The same nation was addressed by John on the subject of an immersion of reformation for the remission of sins—thus paving the way for that more glorious consummation which was to be fully accomplished by the Messiah; and which was done by him through Peter on the day of Pentecost. "Reform." says Peter, "and be immersed every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of your sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is to you and to your children, AND TO ALL THAT ARE AFAR OFF, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Thus the *knowledge of salvation* in the remission of their sins, given by John to the Jews, was by the Messiah diffused to the world, and that too by the same institution. This matter, however, will be more fully explained in another part of this essay, and here we drop it for the present, and proceed to inquire the object of John's immersion.

What, then, was the design of John's immersion? If we could forget the errors of systems, this query would admit an easy and safe answer. But the reign of speculation has not ceased yet, and we must endeavor to establish the fact that John's immersion was ordained for a two-fold object. The first was to give "a people the knowledge of salvation in the remission of their sins." This knowledge led its possessors into the presence of the second object—prepared them for appreciating the glorious, yet singular character, who was about showing himself to the children of men. It was designed to strip entirely off the scales from the eyes, to unstop the ears, to cleanse the heart from iniquity—to purify, in brief, the whole man,* in order that he might lay hold of all the excellencies of the great teacher sent from heaven. In effecting this state of things, it was necessary, as Paul said on a different occasion, that Heaven should leave no doubt nor uncertainty on the minds of this people—this prepared people—it was absolutely and highly important that there should be no hesitancy in their thoughts, but that every thing should be well secured—established upon an impregnable foundation; one that could defy all assaults. Having this begun confidence, in walking towards him, who was to come there was every reason in favor of their continuing to grow in confidence after reaching him. Having commenced running well, every thing was favorable to their continuance in it. This was the effect of one of the simplest propositions in the world—a belief in the testimony of God—a certainty that he means at all times just what he said; and we are bold in the affirmation, that no being has ever yet been converted to God, who did not take him at what he said.

* By a knowledge of his innocence.

Digitized by Google

No man in full possession of his reason would ever lay hold upon Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world, if God had taught that he had sent his only begotten son into the world, not to save it, but that through him it might be condemned. The singular anomaly now met with frequently—the believer and unbeliever of God, united in the same person, was not to be found in the days of God's teachers. But system has run rioting through the plainest principles of revelation, and has become wanton and besotted in its dark meanderings. It has seized the government of God, dethroned reason, immolated common sense, and darkened counsel, until "the old paths" have become almost forgotten, if not quite; since now that we have cleared them of rubbish, they are called new avenues. We rejoice, however, that though it has usurped the altar and the throne, there is a redeeming spirit abroad upon the earth that will not tire in its destruction.

Laying aside system, then, let us mix with the throngs who went out to see John the Immerser—let us use our own eyes and ears in receiving his proclamation, and what do we find him? A reed shaken by the wind? A man effeminately dressed? Or a Prophet? Yes, something superior to a Prophet, for this is the sent messenger, who is to prepare the way of the Lord. Let us find, then, how this is accomplished in the hands of John. Zacharias, under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, tells us, "You shall go before the Lord to prepare his way," [how, Zacharias?] '*by giving the* KNOWLEDGE OF SALVATION *to his people in the remission of their sins*, through the tender compassion of our God,' &c. Here, then, we find there was to be no mistake in the matter of salvation in the remission of the sins of this people—it was to be a certainty of perception—no conjecture was to linger around this important point—it was to be so clear that a beam from the meridian sun should not be able to cast a ray more of light upon it. Such was the prophecy of Zacharias. What was John's teaching? Just in harmony with the prophetic teaching of the Holy Spirit. Thus John came immersing in the wilderness, and publishing the *immersion of reformation* for the remission of sins. All the country went rushing to Jordan—the cities poured forth their denizens, and they were immersed by John in Jordan, confessing their sins. Now all this multitude knew when John said *Be immersed for the remission of sins*, what he meant; and they knew, too, that he meant neither more nor less than he said. As soon as they were immersed, they enjoyed the *knowledge* of the remission of their sins—if, indeed, they set to their seals that God was true. This gave them joy too, not only because they were disenthralled from their former iniquity, but they now looked forward confidently for salvation from the impending vengeance, of which we cannot now speak particularly. Not one of all the persons who flocked to hear John publish the reign of heaven, was taught to look for the remission of his sins—the knowledge of salvation, through any other mean than the one he proclaimed to the people. We never hear him teaching many kinds of salvation—many means of enjoyment of the knowledge of remission of their sins. He performed the task assigned him by Heaven, with singleness of purpose, and with the same clearness, distinctness, and simplicity that mark the character of every divinely attested minister mentioned in the Book of God. What men may choose to say now on this subject is none of our business—we are attending to the days of John—not to this perverse generation.

Having thus shown that the Holy Spirit taught that John should go before the Lord, to prepare his way, by giving his people the knowledge of salvation in the remission of their sins—having heard John's proclamation of immersion of reformation for the remission of sins, and shown its accordance with the prediction of Zacharias, we shall pass to the second object as detailed by John himself. A people was now prepared by pardon—by knowing their salvation —for the Lord. How was he to be known, for as yet John did not know who this personage was, whose shoe latchets he was not worthy to unloose? Hear John's testimony, and behold the goodness of God in furnishing us with indubitable evidence of this great fact. It was not left to idle conjecture—it wa

Digitized by Google

no day dream of John's—not one of his night visions. The testimony attesting this fact, like that for the remission of sins, was full and clear. There was no mystery, no doubt, no obscurity about the matter. Listen to John, you dreamers of spiritual visitations, and learn a lesson: "This is he" (says John) "concerning whom I said, After me comes a man, who is preferred to me; for he was before me. As for me, I knew him not; but, that he might be made *manifest* to Israel, I am come immersing in water." John testified farther, saying, "I saw the Spirit descending from heaven, like a dove, and remaining upon him. For my part, *I should not have known him*, had not He, who sent me to immerse in water, told me, Upon whom you shall see the Spirit descending, and remaining, the same is He who immerses in the Holy Spirit. Having, therefore, seen this, I testify that he is the Son of God." "Here, then, the "prepared people" received assurance of the highest nature that Heaven could present—testimony was the sole means by which John arrived at his faith that Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of the Most High; and this testimony of John's was the only mean by which the people under his instruction found out the Lord Messiah. Myriads received the testimony—they enjoyed a lively confidence in the knowledge of their salvation, in the remission of their sins. There was no defect in the testimony to this great vivifying principle—it was perfect and complete, for it was sealed and attested by God himself. The evidence to the truth, that Jesus was the person described by Moses in the law, and by the Prophets, was equally clear and decisive. Hence John speaks positively—no faltering in his speech. He had said the things spoken of by God himself, and he just declares the fact at once, without entering into any subtleties and refinements about faith of different kinds. Here, then, we conclude after seeing and hearing all these matters from John, is a most wonderful display of love to men on the part of God—an anxious solicitude, if we may so express ourselves, on the part of Jehovah to give this ancient people, this elect race, a plenary knowledge of their salvation; and this was done, we have seen, by presenting testimony and perceptible matters in connexion with the great truth upon which their preparation for the Lord depended. The Holy Spirit revealed the matter clearly to the people. His operations upon their minds are manifest and forcible. Let us analyze them. First, he sets forth the *words* of Zacharias, the truth that *the* child (John) should go before the Lord, preparing his way, by giving the knowledge of salvation, in *the* remission of their sins. Secondly, we have John's commentary or application of this prophetic declaration, when he came, publishing the immersion of reformation *for the remission of sins*. Indeed, it is the only way John proclaimed for the enjoyment of the knowledge of salvation. True, he speaks of the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world; but this is expressive of the heavenly authority of his ordinance of immersion. Thirdly, we have the positive authority of John, conveyed in words, of the truth of the pretensions of Jesus of Nazareth to the Messiahship—and the connexion of the immersion with this very important truth has been already explained.

There is one very important consideration in regard to this arrangement of Heaven, which we have purposely reserved for the present stage of the argument, and we beg for it the dispassionate investigation of every Berean. It is—That the people to whom John addressed himself, were, at the time, without the full blaze of light, which they subsequently enjoyed—in obtaining the knowledge of salvation, in the remission of their sins, they had to depend entirely upon John's teaching. His testimony was the only light which they could enjoy, and we have shown already ALL that he taught upon this deeply interesting subject. On the matter of remission of sins, his testimony was decidedly in favor of immersion as the act that gave the Jews the certainty of perception in this gratifying truth. We therefore conclude this branch of our inquiry by reiterating the proposition which we consider fully proved, if men can venture to rely upon the testimony of the Holy Spirit. The present inquiry was to ascertain and develope the design of John's immersion—this we have shown was instituted for the purpose of preparing a people for

Digitized by Google

the Lord, and for *manifesting* the real Messiah to the Jewish people. The people were to be prepared, according to Zacharias, by having given to them THE KNOWLEDGE OF SALVATION IN THE REMISSION OF SINS—and for the acquirement of this knowledge of salvation, we find John proclaiming the immersion of reformation for the remission of sins. John's bears the most unequivocal testimony too, to the other design—the manifestation of the Saviour to Israel.

Such was the course of Jehovah towards the Jews—the last effort of Heaven for the reformation of Israel, was now in progress—the terms were simple and fair—stamped with the seal of Heaven in their beauty and directness. Earth, with all its philosophy, its science and wisdom, never could have generated such an exhibition of philanthropy, of kindness, and perfect knowledge of human nature—the germ was not within herself, and she never could have created it. As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are God's ways higher than man's. Look at the work of the system-mongers of our degenerate age, and contrast them with this divine and glorious plant. How meagre, how lean, how weakly the one, compared with the hale, sound, and vigorous growth of the other. Of one the whole heart is diseased—the head is sick—decay is in all its limbs. But the other is ruddy with blooming health—and strong in a sound constitution. One is the work of men—the other is the work of God. The one is the fruitful parent of a numerous progeny of weeds—doubt, fear, uncertainty, and distrust, are the foliage of this plant. Joy, peace, confidence, and good works, are the fruits of the other. Who could hesitate in the choice of the two?

In our next we shall endeavor to inquire into the nature of the sins remitted. We trust that our readers will not be startled at this matter on account of its novelty, but beg their indulgence until the whole matter is laid before them—the mean of remission—the nature of the sins remitted—the salvation obtained in consequence of obedience to John's proclamation—the principles of the government published by John—the relationship of John's immersion and Christian immersion—the differences, &c. are all matters of great interest to us all, though the dispensation has passed away. They have an important bearing, however, upon many points, which would be difficult without a correct knowledge of these principles. After we have finished, objections are respectfully requested. T. S. B.

Louisville, June 7th, 1835.

Renunciation of Sectarianism.

NEW MARKET, Shenandoah county, Va.
May 20th, 1835.

Dear brother Campbell,

IN order that editors of publications which "vindicate the ways of God to men," may not become dispirited in their arduous and responsible avocation, it is proper that they should occasionally hear of the progress of the cause of God in the world, and the aid which their publications impart to the enlargement of the Messiah's kingdom. I will, therefore, briefly state how your *Harbinger* contributed to my becoming a participant in the "true grace of God."

From my boyhood up, I had an attachment to the simple, yet true narrations of the New Testament; but at an inauspicious time I fell into the hands of theorizers, and my mind became nebulous with metaphysical religious dogmas. In my 18th year I united myself to the Lutheran Church—was zealous in religion, and was persuaded to believe that I had a call to the ministry. I made application to a

Digitized by Google

reverend father for ministerial preparation. He interrogated me somewhat closely about the clearness of my supernatural or special call to the ministry; I answered all his queries with satisfaction to himself. He pronounced me called. Accordingly I made arrangements to receive literary qualifications for preaching. It is now nearly ten years since I was licensed by a synod to preach *the doctrines of the Lutheran Church.* I set out in my ministerial career a complete spiritualist, believing a little noise in religious meetings not at all incompatible with vital religion. Feeling was my standard of true, experimental religion. When I felt well, i. e. when my feelings were excited, I supposed that I received a new accession of grace—when the people to whom I preached wept much under my declamations, I considered it an *outpouring* of the Spirit. But in all my flows of feelings, I could not hear a voice telling me that my sins were *forgiven*—others talked about having heard such a voice, or about feeling a sudden liberation from their burden of sins. My not realizing such a thing, dejected me not a little. I prayed in private for the impartation of a knowledge of my sins forgiven, but could never realize it. This and other considerations destroyed my confidence in my special vocation to the ministry, and I was almost determined to relinquish preaching forever. About this time, however, I had seen something of the sophistical preaching of revival men in the Lutheran Church. The superficial knowledge I even then had of the import of the New Testament, enabled me to see some discrepance between the extravagant operations of wild revivalists and the artless and uniform procedures of the primitive propagators of christianity. Revival extravagance impelled me to read and study the New Testament with more attention than usual, aye, and in connexion too. I soon became convinced that many passages in the living oracles were "handled deceitfully," and applied to things of which the Apostles never thought. Not long after this, I accidentally got a number of the "*Christian Baptist*" into my hands. I read a few paragraphs, of which I can call only one to mind at present: it contained remarks on Paul's "natural man," and the views there expressed were very analogous to thoughts which sometimes flitted through my mind in relation to the natural man and a "state of nature." In short, I was convinced that the author of that number spoke like a man of *sense*, if not like a man of *feeling*. But he was a Baptist, and this diverted me from paying as much attention to the pamphlet as I afterwards wished I had given it. Some time after that I had a longing for that publication, but I had forgotten the place of its Editor's residence, and as I got the abovementioned number into my hands about one hundred miles from my residence, I could not easily ascertain the place of its publication. In the mean time I preached the dogmas of the church; but with some diffidence, because for some of her usages I could not find any apostolic authority; and in my inquisitive interviews with my clerical brethren, I discovered that many of them were very superficial in their acquaintance with the tenor of God's word, notwithstanding their unequivocal pre-

Digitized by Google

tensions to intellectual accomplishments; and consequently, I derived little satisfaction from them relative to my difficulties. My confidence in revival measures at this time was totally destroyed. I accidentally ascertained the name and place of residence of the Editor of the "Millennial Harbinger," the successor of the "Baptist," and I determined to procure it. I did so. It soon became a welcome visiter. By reading it, I learned that the religion of Christ was derived not from Rome, nor from Wittenberg, nor Geneva, but from Jerusalem—that we must begin our christian race at the goal which Peter formed on the day of Pentecost. Your "Extras" on Regeneration and the Reign of Heaven have furnished me with a key to the New Testament, by the use of which the simplicity and tangibleness of primitive christianity became irresistibly apparent to me—the nebulous mysticism which had hid the true gospel from me, was dispelled—and I became determined to disengage myself from every dogma that is not plainly inculcated in the sacred volume.

But what a conflict was to be endured in the execution of my determinations! Popularity was to be sacrificed! pecuniary advantages were to be given up! the frowns of friends, acquaintances, and relations were to be encountered—assaults by arguments to be repelled—defamation, slander, and ridicule to be endured. But in view of a happy immortality, what are these things?—*Transitory as the breath of mortals.* And that man who is unwilling to follow Jesus through evil report, and to "go forth with him without the camp, bearing his reproach," can have but a weak attachment to the Prince of Peace.

Lest I should be too prolix in my narrative, I will state to you, that about six weeks ago I was immersed for the remission of sins, and am now a citizen of the kingdom of heaven. Before that I spoke well of the King, and had an attachment for him; but still I was not naturalized into his kingdom. What peace and quietude of conscience do the true subjects of his kingdom enjoy! O that all might realize the salvation of God!

The difficulties, oppositions, and misrepresentations which I apprehended in consequence of my renunciation of traditionary religion, are all coming on in close succession, sometimes simultaneously. The churches into which I used to be invited to preach, are now shut against me—my quondam clerical associates prejudice the popular mind against me, by representing me as mentally unhinged, and seduced by a Unitarian Baptist, &c. &c. Let it be so. He who sits in the heavens will adjust all. Let me be obedient to *him*, and I shall be firm in the hope of enjoying a place "where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest."

Since my immersion my circumstances did not permit me to proclaim much; however, I hope I shall soon be enabled to be more active in the proclamation of the word in my immediate neighborhood; and were I not under the necessity of procuring a support for my family by teaching a school, I would make excursions of considerable distance to proclaim the wholesome doctrines of the gospel.

Yours in the kingdom of Jesus,

SAMUEL K. HOSHOUR.

Sketch of a Tour of 75 Days.

ON the 30th of March, accompanied by brother *Fanning*, we sailed from Nashville for Louisville. At the latter place we safely arrived on the 3d of April, and were kindly and courteously received by the brethren. During our sojourn we partook of the hospitalities of Mr. *William Graham*, whose amiable consort is a disciple ardently devoted to the Lord.

Our time was so fully engrossed between public instruction and private conversation, from our arrival in Louisville to the end of our tour, that we could not even make a memorandum of any thing which occurred; we can, therefore, only give a very general outline of things.

It has happened in Louisville, as in most other places where disputes about meeting houses have existed, and where, from this cause, hindrances have been thrown in the way of the weekly meetings of the brethren, that the growth has been rather downward than upward, and progress rather backward than forward. Other unpropitious circumstances have much retarded the progress of the cause in this city, so that the labors of our very intelligent and amiable brother *Gates* could avail little during the last season. The disproportion between males and females in this church is much greater than usual; and although the sisters possess as much intelligence, zeal, and devotion, as can be found in any of the western cities, still in a city so commercial and so enslaved to sensual pleasure as is this greatemporium of Kentucky, they cannot exert that sort of influence which is necessary to command public attention and to silence those boisterous declaimers, whose strength is found in the weakness, and whose eloquence exists in the prejudice and ignorance of the people.

There are, indeed, a few brethren in this church, whose talents and acquisitions properly directed, as they are now likely to be, might achieve much for the prosperity and growth of the congregation. They have, moreover, disposed of their interest in the Baptist meeting house, and purchased a Methodist house, so that their meetings can be regularly and statedly kept up. This house, for the time being, will accommodate the brethren in their weekly meetings, though not large enough for the demands of the public. Our much esteemed and beloved brother *Theodore S. Bell*, M. D. is well disposed to build up the congregation, and eminently qualified for this work, if professional engagements did not so much interfere. He has the confidence of the brethren and of the citizens generally, and has received at least five talents, which I earnestly desire he may lay out to great advantage to himself and the cause. I feel, moreover, very confident that he will do his duty.

Our sojourn in the city was only for a few days; but they were very pleasant to us, and, I trust, profitable to the community. Several discourses were delivered during our stay, for we had the pleasure of being saluted in Louisville by our indefatigable brethren John Smith, of Montgomery; Dr. Hall, now of Gorgetown, our companion in our last Virginia tour; and the excellent Benjamin Allen, of Jefferson, with various other brethren who do not labor so publicly in the kingdom of the Messiah. We had as full and attentive an audience as could have been wished, unless we had had a house as large as any in the United States. Several confessed the Lord and were immersed.

We also visited New Albany and Jeffersonville, Indiana, before our departure from Louisville, and got acquainted with the brethren in these churches. Our visit, however, only amounted to a single discourse in each place. We spent the evening with our good brother Dr. *Field*, of emancipation memory. He is in body, soul, and spirit opposed to American slavery, and would, if he could, have one American Jubilee, which would leave no room for a second. I am not sure, however, but he loves liberty even to intolerance, and would compel the churches into measures unprecedented in the days of the Apostles. There is, indeed, a healthy, rational, and scriptural reform of this great and growing evil much wanted, and which I am of the opinion would be satisfactory to the Doctor and many other good men, which, as an incipient measure,

Digitized by Google

is certainly practicable, and absolutely necessary to our pleading of reformation. No christian can, on the principle of humanity or the gospel, sell a wife from a husband, or a husband from a wife; an infant from its parents, or parents from their infant offspring, under any pretence whatever. And no laws of any state can justify any christian man in keeping his servants ignorant of God. of Jesus Christ, or of the Bible facts, any more than the laws of Greece or Rome could have compelled the first christians to have worshipped idols, or to have called Jesus anathema, or sanctioned them in so doing. Of all this I have no more doubt than I have that Jesus is the Messiah.

From Louisville to Madison, we arrived on the 9th, and were very hospitably received by General Stapp, of that place. We addressed the citizens twice in the Methodist meeting house, which is a very large and commodious edifice, and which was very liberally tendered us by that community. We were sorry to leave our very kind host where we found him—only a proselyte of the gate.

On the morning of the 11th we arrived at Cincinnati, and took up our lodgings at the residence of our much admired and beloved brother *Burnet*, whose labors in the cause of reform are so generally known and so highly appreciated by all the brethren, East and West.

With the congregation in Cincinnati, and the brethren at Carthage and in the surrounding country, we spent some very happy days. We were much gratified in meeting our old fellow-laborer, the distinguished Editor of the *Evangelist*, in good health and spirits, as ardent as ever in the service of our good Master in heaven; also, the talented and beloved Physician *Richardson*, and the veteran Dr. *Wright*, both now of Carthage. These were old acquaintances, and, with all the pleasant associations of former years, we saluted them in the Lord. There, too, we met our good brother Challen, now of Lexington, well tried and faithful in the labors of the word. The brethren in Cincinnati have been much refreshed, and the cause revived by the assiduous labors of brother Burnet in that city during the last year. At Carthage all things go on well. During our visit to the village two were immersed, and a few in Cincinnati. Brother Brown, of Indiana, brother Jameson, and other brethren from the country, living at a distance, who have been successfully laboring in the word, met us at Carthage and Cincinnati. These brethren refreshed us much with the good tidings which they brought of the successful proclamation of the doctrine of reformation in various portions of the country.

From Cincinnati we passed into Kentucky, left the river, and visited Georgetown, Choctaw Academy, Frankfort, Lexington, Paris, Mount Sterling, May's Lick, Washington, and Maysville. We have not the means to record the many pleasing scenes through which we passed in our rapid transit through this garden of Kentucky. In Georgetown we spoke thrice to a most attentive and intelligent audience. Surrounded with many of our old, long known, and well tried fellow-laborers, and many of the Elders of the churches and ornaments of the reformation, we felt peculiarly happy. There we had sweet communion with many approved spirits, dear to us in the Lord. There were the veteran soldiers of the cross, Jacob Creath, Sen. William Morton, John T. Johnson, P. S. Fall, and John Rogers the Evangelist. There were also brethren Leonard Flemming, Parmer, Gano, Irvine, B H. Payne, G W Elley, T. M. Allen, and others, who, though not actual laborers in the word and teaching, are, nevertheless, influential, useful, and efficient soldiers in the ranks of reformation. Of this class are such men as Elder Bullock of Versailles, B. A. Hicks, W. Z. Thompson, Father Sullivan, Peter Higbie, J. Sims, J Bowman, James Mason, some of whom we saw at Georgetown, Lexington, Frankfort and other places on our tour.

From Georgetown, with a number of brethren, we repaired in company with the Hon. Richard M. Johnson to his residence, some 8 miles distant from town. There in the evening we addressed the Indians of the Choctaw nation, in the Academy which Congress has founded and sustains for these red men, sons of the forest. A number of citizens attended with them to our address on the fixed and immutable principles of the divine government, and of the future

Digitized by Google

and final judgment of the world. We were heard by the Indians with profound attention. We spent a very agreeable evening with Col. Johnson, and on the next morning repaired to Frankfort. The Methodists opened their house, and permitted us to address the citizens of the political capital on the elements of the gospel. Aided by the facilities of the rail road, we arrived in Lexington, the literary capital of Kentucky, on Saturday evening. Favored by the Trustees of the Transylvania University, of whom brother Jacob Creath, Jun. is one, with their large and elegant room in the College buildings, we twice addressed on the Lord's day, a very large and respectable assemblage of the citizens of this interesting and refined city. After having partaken of the hospitalities of our old friend J. Ficklin, Esq. and communed with the brethren, on Monday evening, carried by our ardent and devoted brother B. H. Payne in his gig, we proceeded to brother Williams, of Paris. On the next day we delivered two discourses to the citizens, and on the morrow pursued our journey to Mount Sterling. After speaking twice to a very crowded house in that town, in company with our good brother J. N. Payne, we proceeded to May's Lick, where we had a two days' meeting. Here we found ourselves in the midst of our first acquaintances in Kentucky, accompanied as we had been with brethren Payne, Hall, Gates, and Flemming. Our good brother Asa Runyan was again our host, where many of our beloved brethren and sisters resorted. O that we had in every state in the union ten thousand sisters such as sister Runyan of Bath, sister Payne of Mount Sterling, and sister Reed of Washington! Then would the word of the Lord run and be glorified. Exhausted beyond measure with fifty days speaking, we only spoke twice at May's Lick. We were aided much at Mount Sterling and some other places by our indefatigable and successful brother Rayns, who is now located at Paris, and at May's Lick specially by brother Gates and Hall. We spoke at Washington on Monday, at noon; and in the evening in Maysville.

Brother O'Kane, who met us at May's Lick, having labored much in Mason county, and immersed many during the Fall, we found the brethren generally very zealous and much engaged in the good cause.

In Maysville a great change had taken place since my last visit to it. The brethren have increased in numbers, in zeal, in knowledge, and they have been compelled to erect a meeting house this summer. Brother Burnet, a few weeks before my arrival, spent some two weeks in that town, and added 23 members to the congregation. Brother Philips, formerly of Steubenville, now located here, zealous and diligent as in former years, labors in the vicinity around Maysville as acceptably as formerly. Here we continued till the 6th, and spoke some three or four times.

Thus ended the labors of fifty-four days almost continued speaking: for besides delivering so many public discourses in so many days, our conversations were almost incessant. We had the pleasure of being instrumental in adding forty-five persons to the christian ranks during the whole tour, as well as of inducing some to return to the fold who had forsaken the flock of God—of disabusing the public ear of many misapprehensions and misrepresentations of our principles—of leaving a favorable impression on the public mind of the necessity and utility of the cause we plead—and of stirring up the brethren to more zeal and diligence in the good work of the Lord. Our brother Fanning left us at Lexington—brother Gates, at Maysville—and brother Flemming, who met us at Nashville, saw us aboard of the Huntress at Maysville. Here brother Rowzee and some of the sisters bade us adieu on board at 9 o'clock in the evening of the 6th. We arrived safely at Bethany on the evening of the 10th, and found all well. The Lord be praised for all his mercies to us and to the children of men!

EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

[CIRCULAR.]

Union of Disciples in the City of New York.

Very dear Brethren,

ON Lord's day, March 15, 1835, a large majority of the disciples meeting for worship in King, formerly of Hudson street, formed a union with the brethren meeting for worship in Laurens street.

On the Lord's day above mentioned at 3 o'clock P. M., the brethren of King street with all their office bearers, (excepting one of the elders, Jonathan Hatfield, who was prevented being present through sickness,) assembled in Laurens street, and took their seats on the right hand of the elders; (the elder of each church being seated together.) After singing and prayer, Elder Barker of the Laurens street church read 12 chap. Romans; then stated the interesting object of the meeting;—the union of the two churches into one body, following it with some very appropriate remarks, shewing that the New Testament alone is the only foundation of christian union; that all humanisms, commandments, and speculations of men, should have no place among the disciples; but that the word of Christ should dwell in them richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another from the Living Oracles alone. And in a very forcible manner enlarged on the blessings that would result from such a union among christians, in their peace and edification; and by their combined efforts, to be the happy means of saving others. Thus, being united in one body, of one heart, and one soul, speaking the same things to saints and sinners, in the manner the scriptures address each, would realize the great blessings contained in our Lord's prayer, recorded 17 chap. John. After which the elder of each church, gave to each other the right hand of fellowship, in the name and behalf of the members of each society;—which at that instant constituted us one congregation in the Lord. There was a solemn pause for a moment, when the elder of the King street church arose and addressed the brethren with much feeling, by saying he had for a long time ardently desired the union of the two societies, who had in this great city, taken the New Testament as their bond of union, that we had now seen our anticipations realized. To our great joy, we are no longer two, but one congregation, surrounding one table of the Lord.

Our brother closed this most solemn and impressive address, with reading a hymn or song of his own composition on the importance of christian love and union, when all the disciples rose up and sung this hymn with gratitude in their hearts to the Lord.

There were probably 120 or more disciples present on this solemn but joyful occasion.—After which all the disciples present were affectionately invited to partake of the Lord's Supper. We closed this feast of love; with this suitable spiritual song:—

"How pleasant to behold and see,
The friends of Jesus all agree;
To sit around his sacred board,
As members of one common Lord."

And concluded with the apostolic benediction; when a mutual interchange of brotherly feeling, and congratulations took place among the disciples. We appeared to separate from this heavenly place, realizing the blessings of christian unity, foretold by the inspired penman in the 133d Psalm. "Behold how good and pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

Our present number (as on the day of Pentecost,) is about 120 disciples. On each Lord's day we meet in the morning, at half past ten o'clock, for divine worship, reading the Scriptures, teaching, &c. In the afternoon, 3 o'clock, we assemble more especially as a church, to break the loaf, the fellowship or contribution for the poor saints, singing and prayer, reading the word, and mutual exhortations of the brethren; and in the evening, 7 o'clock, to proclaim the gospel to those who are without.—On Monday evenings the church holds

Digitized by Google

a Bible class, to examine the Scriptures and each one to give their views. On Wednesday evenings, social worship, teaching &c. and on Friday evenings for prayer, and mutual exhortations of the brethren.

A few months before the union, a large and important field of labor was left unoccupied by the decease of our highly esteemed and aged brother Elder Robert Scott, who had devoted more than half a century in preaching the "unsearchable riches of Christ." He not only preached but exemplified the effects of the gospel in his life, by making it without charge, laboring with his own hands, and by his good works, and by his ready submission to all its requirements. He was 14 years an elder of the church at Rhinebeck, Duchess county New York, in which place he rested from his labors, in the joyful hope of a blessed immortality, on the 28th of last September, aged 74 years, leaving behind him his decided testimony to the truth of the Apostolic gospel in all its parts, as fully developed by the Holy Spirit on the ever memorable day of Pentecost, and in the subsequent preaching of the Apostles, as recorded in that sacred book of the Acts of the Apostles.

For 3 or 4 years Elder Barker and others of the brethren of New York, occasionally visited and labored among them; but on the decease of our aged brother, the church in Laurens street set apart brother John Black as a missionary, and sent him out for 6 months to labor his whole time at Rhinebeck and its vicinity, on the east side; and Kingston and the towns adjacent on the west side of the Hudson river, about 100 miles above the city of New York.

A short time after the union of the two churches, brother Black returned, his time having expired; when he gave us an account of missionary labors, by stating that he had met with much opposition, and many things to discourage him at first, but by a patient perseverence in holding forth the original gospel to his fellow men, and endeavouring to manifest its spirit of love and meekness toward the gainsayers, had a tendency in a good measure to overcome the prejudice of the people; so that now many come out to hear, although few as yet manifest a disposition to obey the gospel by immersion, for remission of their sins; but that instead of empty bences as at first, there are full houses and attentive audiences, and a prospect of much good being done this season in that region of country.

We therefore requested brother Black to continue his labors there as a missionary for 12 months longer, which he cheerfully accepted, and immediately entered upon, (taking his wife with him, a most amiable sister,) intending to labor with his hands, as much as his time will allow, in the full confidence of the brethren that he will do the work of the Lord faithfully, praying to the great Head of the church that his labors of love may be abundantly blessed to the conversion of sinners, and in assisting in the establishing of the saints in the primitive order of worship.

May favor, mercy, and peace, be multiplied to all the holy brethren throughout the world, through the knowledge of, and obedience to, our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

Signed in behalf of the church of Christ, meeting for worship, No. 158 Laurens street, near Prince street.

BENJN. S. HENDRICKSON.
DANL. MONROE.
JONATHAN HATFIELD.
JAMES SAUNDERS.

New York, June 1, 1835.

TWO weeks ago I went to the Episcopal Church in this place, and there saw the performance of the *fourth* mode of baptism. The Parson, after dipping his fingers in a bowl of water, and letting them drip till he could repeat the ceremony, "I baptize thee," &c. put his almost dry fingers on the forehead of the child, and finally declared it regenerate. So we now have baptism without immersion, pouring, or sprinkling! OHIO.

Digitized by Google

CLERICAL PRESUMPTION.

GREENCASTLE, Putnam county, Ind. January 29, 1835.

Brother Campbell,

THE professed disciples of John Wesley, called the Wesleyan Methodists, held, what they call, a quarterly meeting in this town, last week. I was present part of the time. On Sunday night, after all the candles were lighted, Mr. J. L. arose, and informed us, that he was going to give us just what God should reveal to his mind, after he arose to his feet: but unfortunately he was compelled, for want of *"revelations,"* to spend the greater part of his time, in telling us of things he had seen and heard. But, worst of all, before he sat down, he plainly told us he was "the vicegerent of God." Strange presumptuous infatuation!—Ominous, alarming signs of our times! O how this marks the degeneracy of our age and country!—That a poor unsanctioned fellow-creature, without any thing distinguishing, but a superabundant portion of presumptuous impudence, should be sustained in the blasphemous assumption of the official dignity of Jesus Christ, the only vicegerent of God that ever did, or ever will, appear in our world.—Tell it not in Rome, publish it not in the streets of Hindostan, that a professed teacher of the christian religion, in a Protestant country. in the nineteenth century, did actually assume the character of "vicegerent of God," in the presence of a very large and respectable congregation, without any manifest expression of disapprobation. And stranger still, if possible, at the close of his address, after all his pretensions, to ask God to "pardon his errors"! *Query*—If Mr. J. L. is God's vicegerent, and speaks by immediate revelation, as he affirmed; did he not, in so praying, ask God to pardon his own errors! Alas! the times! But we leave our Putnam claimant, the Pope of Rome, and the grand Lama, to settle their high pretensions, to the singular honor of being "vicegerent of God." AN OBSERVER.

☞ Several communications are yet on file, which ought to have appeared in the present number; particularly some communications from our venerable brother *Ballantine*, now in a very low state of health, and expecting soon to pass the Jordan of time. We have also our No. 2, on Romanism, Essays on Education and Reformation, still in arrears—some remarks on the late session of the General Assembly, &c. &c. Some, or all of these, with various communications on the progress of reform, shall appear in our next.

☞ The CHRISTIAN BAPTIST, new edition, by brother *Burnet*, is received here. Orders will be filled as soon as possible. The work is very neatly executed and substantially bound, spring backs. Brother Burnet has fully redeemed his pledge in getting up this edition, and it is hoped that he will find a remuneration of the very heavy expences incurred in this undertaking. The brethren, I feel confident, will not suffer him to lose property in this enterprize to promulge the principles of reformation.

☞ Brother *Hayden's* NEW MUSIC BOOK, adapted to our selection of Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, is received here. Orders for it will be filled in conjunction with orders for our works, addressed to *M'Vay & Ewing*. I learn from those who are much better judges than I am, that this is one of the very best selections of sacred music, suited to social worship. The retail price is 50 Cents. EDITOR.

ERRATA.

No. 2, vol. 6, page 62, 13 lines from the top, for "conceive," read *conceives*. Same page, 22 lines from the bottom, for "come," read *came*. Page 63, 10 lines from the top, for "considerably north of such a line," read *south* of such a line. Same page, for "and which," read *and to which*.

Page 88, line 5, No. 2, vol. 6, for "The coffin, without a tenant, was borne on the shoulders of the military"—read, The hearse, without a tenant, was escorted by the military. Line 13, for "Over an empty coffin"—read, Over an empty hearse.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number VIII.——Volume VI.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. August, 1835.

To the Regular Baptists.

EXPERIENCE.

OF all the deceptions in your system of religion, none is, perhaps, more fallacious than what you call *religious experience.* To lay a foundation for our strictures, and to try you on this important subject, we bring you and ourselves back to the law and to the testimony. You ring changes incessantly upon what you call *regeneration,* to the no small amusement of the Sceptics, and to the no less excitement of the tender or misguided consciences of your implicit hearers. We have told you that the word *regeneration* occurs only twice in King James' translation of the sacred writings, and but once to signify baptism or immersion. After all the changes you ring on the word *regeneration,* it will not sound once to your sense of the term—after all the beating you can give it, it will not give out but one sound; and that is *immersion.* Nor are you more accurate in what you call *experience,* which you make the door into your churches.

The word *experience* occurs only three times in King James' translation of the Scriptures; and in these places it has no reference to what you mean by *experience.* We shall find, on investigation, that its scriptural meaning is '*Proof upon trial.*' The first time it occurs is in Genesis xxx. 27. in which passage Laban says that he had learned from experience that the Lord had blessed him for Jacob's sake. The passage runs thus in the original: "And Laban said to him," [Jacob] "Seeing I have found favor in thy eyes, I have observed with great attention, the Lord hath blessed me on thy account." This passage has nothing to do with what you call *experience.*— Whether Laban was a worldly, covetous man, or not, he was a man of observation, and he had observed with minute attention that Providence had smiled upon him by Jacob's diligent attention to busi-

Digitized by Google

ness. The second time that this word *experience* occurs in King James' translation is in Eccles. x. 16. "I communed," says Solomon, "with mine own heart, saying, Lo, I am come to great estate, and have gotten more wisdom than all that have been before me in Jerusalem; yea, my heart had great experience of wisdom and knowledge." Literally—'I have spoken with my heart, saying, Behold, I have become great, and have added to myself wisdom above all that have been before me in Jerusalem, and my heart hath seen much wisdom and knowledge." The word denoting what you call *experience* does not occur here. Solomon is stating that in his observation of men and of things in the state of society in which he lived, that the knowledge and the wisdom, the madness and the folly of the human kind was "vexation of spirit." He adds, "For in much wisdom is much grief, and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow." How true is this of all the works and ways of men!

The next and last passage where the word *experience* occurs in King James' translation is found in Romans v. 4.—a part of that beautiful climax whereby Paul and all the redeemed have climbed to heaven. It is worth our while to ascend the ladder. At the foot of it—its foot is on earth, and its top in heaven. At the foot of it, "we rejoice in hope of the glory of God"—the full blaze of eternal felicity. But we are upon the earth. Well! be it so. We "glory," we boast in tribulations, in all our sufferings for the gospel's sake—"knowing that tribulation worketh patience"—a placid endurance of whatever is the will of our heavenly Father. And patience worketh "experience." Here the word *experience* occurs, but not in your sense. Its meaning is, as we have said, 'proof upon trial.' Laban proved in the prosperity of his flocks, the faithful care of his shepherd Jacob; Solomon proved from the works and ways of men, that all under the sun was vanity and vexation of spirit. And now the christians prove by a patient continuance in well doing what their God is able to effect in their deliverance—for "experience wrought hope." The more experience they had in what their heavenly Father was able to do for them in all the persecutions they endured, the more animated was their hope of what he would do for them in raising their bodies from the grave, that in soul, body, and spirit they might be made like their glorious Head in heaven—the Lord Jesus Christ. And this "hope" they had of immortality, "made them not ashamed, because the love of God"—not their love to God, but his love to them,—"was shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Spirit"—on their believing that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John viii. 16. Now your view of experience, of which you make so much in admission to your churches, is like a man endeavoring to fill his hand full of mist.

The richest experience you can collect from the sacred Scriptures is, perhaps, the history of Joseph. He was the beloved son of his father—his brethren conspired against him and sold him to the Egyptians. You know his history—the reason why he was cast into

Digitized by Google

prison—there he waited patiently the divine disposals. The Lord was with Joseph in all his afflictions. At last the Lord delivered him—made him ruler over all Egypt. His brethren came to him. In the end his father was brought to him, and his whole family; and all this was done to fulfil the divine purpose of God towards Abraham's seed. In all this Joseph's "patience wrought experience." If in one instance Joseph's patience had failed, and he had stepped aside from confidence in his God, patience would not have had its perfect work. But he endured, as seeing him who is invisible, and all was well. He had proof on every trial that he endured, that God was able to deliver him, and did deliver him; and thus he had proof—experience of what God is able to effect for all those who put trust in him. But what has Laban's experience, or Solomon's, or Joseph's, or even the experience of the first christians, to do with what you call your experience? Laban's, Solomon's, and Joseph's experience are, indeed, very far from your question; and the experience of the first christians is no less so. They had their experience after they believed in Jesus, and had endured tribulations for the gospel's sake. It was in reproach, in confiscation of goods, in imprisonments, in unjust judgments, in tortures, and in deaths they learned their experience; and their experience was in realizing the truth of the divine promise—"I will never, never leave thee—I will never, never forsake thee." But the experience you call for is a something preparatory to admission to your churches; which is altogether foreign to any thing the Apostles sought as preparatory to admission into the churches they planted. I see we must bring you back to first principles. Can you suppose that Peter and the hundred and twenty disciples on the day of Pentecost, required each of the three thousand disciples to give in what you call *experience*, before he was immersed? No. Surely their manner was more effective. They immersed all that confessed that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah—and these were added to the church that same day.

Your monthly, or whatever periodical seasons you have, of examination of experiences for admission to your churches, is fraught with the most deadly influence to the progress of the gospel of Christ. It impedes every exertion to the clear, decided, and immediate belief of the ancient gospel. Every proclaimer of this gospel ought to have immediately in view the present salvation of all his hearers, that they might now believe that Jesus is the Christ, and be saved. He should not be thinking of what are called *candidates*, for a week, a fortnight, or for a month to come. No—"Now is the day of salvation!" "To-day, if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." "Go, preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is immersed, shall be saved." John the Baptist understood this subject well; therefore, he took his station of preaching "in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there," (John iii. 23, 24.) that immediately on the faith of his hearers they might be immersed. "And they came and were immersed." Your modern gospel puts at least the professed salvation of your believers off till to-morrow, or for a

month to come. Not so John the Baptist, nor the Apostles. What a dire influence has your experiences also on your candidates! From the time they have some religious impressions, and form a resolution to get admission to your churches, they are ruminating on how they shall appear before the church; what they shall say to gain admission; what will please you best; and how they shall make up a good *experience.* They are at last brought before the church; and a scene ensues which has often been to me, indeed, a scene producing the most mixed emotions:—A delicate, modest, and unassuming female is introduced to the gaze and observation of the church, and many professed unbelievers, to be interrogated—about what! Why, her *experience.* And now the questions begin: How long is it since you began to think seriously? What was the sermon, or the hymn, or the text of Scripture that first impressed your mind? Were you much distressed? What did you do then? What gave you comfort? Do you think it your duty to be baptized? Have you read our Confession of Faith? And you agree with it so far as you have understood it? Thus one and another, and more are examined till all have done. Then the candidates retire to some place beyond the reach of hearing what the church may say on their *experiences.* Then the church has the power of pronouncing on the *experiences* they have heard, good, bad, or indifferent, in order to the baptism or rejection of the *candidates.* And the candidates are thus kept in durance vile, thinking how the church will dispose of them. When the church does in their wisdom dispose of them, what exultation do the successful candidates feel in their approved experience, and what disappointment wrings the heart of the unsuccessful!

Besides, what a dire effect this system has upon those who have religious impressions, or upon those who have some sinister views of joining the church. I speak to those who are in the habit of attending what are called *church meetings.* What a crowding on the monthly church meetings to hear the experiences! For what end let the crowds and their leaders say. They will inform you of the good, and the bad, and the indifferent experiences of the several candidates.—What a corrupted system of christianity!

Again, we declare as honest men and true, so far as we have been witnesses, that nearly, if not all the questions we have heard proposed to candidates for immersion and admission to your churches, were questions about themselves, their religious feelings, their convictions of sin, their fears and doubts, and hopes and joys; all which any unbeliever may possess: but in which of your churches are questions proposed concerning what the Saviour has asserted—"This is eternal life, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent"? 1 John xxvii. 3. Where are your questions to candidates about God the Father of our Lord Jesus, and about Jesus the only Mediator between God and men? They are kept all in the back ground; or, rather, they are altogether forgotten amidst your corrupted gospel and religious feelings. There never was a more latitudinarian, nor a more self-righteous system, than that which you in-

Digitized by Google

calcate. On the one hand, you take in all who have religious feelings, which you call experience; and when these impressions leave them, for the most part they go back to the world: or, on the other hand, if those impressions remain, the most of their subjects only go about to establish their own righteousness, ignorant both of the justice of the Eternal, and the obedience unto death of the Lord Jesus as the only foundation of peace with God.

Now the question is, and we confess it is of great importance, What is to be substituted for your experience in order to admission to immersion? Here it is necessary to premise: All proclaimers of the gospel go into whatever part of the world Providence casts their lot; they preach the glad tidings; and if they are workmen that need not to be ashamed of their work, they call upon all who believe the report of the gospel, to confess Jesus of Nazareth to be the Son of God. This they always do by words or by signs that this is their faith. They come forward to the proclaimers of the gospel, and either tacitly or in words say, "What shall we do?" The answer is obvious, "Be immersed, every one of you, in the name of Jesus." You need not ask those inquirers, "Do you believe that Jesus is the Christ"? The whole scene declares it; and to ask questions about it is altogether superfluous, and only retards the believers from admission into the kingdom of heaven. They are baptized upon their confession that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ. They may be added in their future profession to this or to that portion of the congregation of Christ; but being immersed into his name, they are subjects of his government wherever they go. Some thus immersed may be so ignorant as to say, 'May we not join with the various sects of the Christian name?' We answer, No. These sects are not observing the commandments of the Saviour in whose name you have been immersed. Or others, still more ignorant, may say, 'Now we are immersed, our sins are blotted out, we may live as we will, and return to our former corrupt ways.' To all such persons we may say as Peter did--"Ye are in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity."

Nor can all this dereliction from professed principles invalidate our manner of reception of professed christians, more than your mode of admitting them by what you call *experience*.

But we do not state the right and the wrong in this important case by our own conceptions. This, as all other matters in the kingdom of the Messiah, must be brought to the law and to the testimony. We must go back to Pentecost. Peter perceived on that day, by the conduct of the three thousand, that they believed that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ; nor did he ask them one question about their faith. The question with them upon their belief that Jesus was the Christ, was, "What shall we do?" He answered them explicitly, and they obeyed. Acts xxiii. 38. The Eunuch, to whom Philip preached Jesus, when they came to a certain water, the Eunuch said, "See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be immersed?" And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the

Digitized by Google

water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he immersed him. Acts viii. 36—38.

Here, then, we have every information, and applicable in all cases, of what is previously necessary to an immerser to immerse believers. All that is required is, that the person immersed believes that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ. In the case of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, Peter required no more than the evident change in their sentiments about Jesus of Nazareth, the effects of his preaching Jesus, their own query, "Brethren, what shall we do?" Here is an example that all proclaimers of the gospel ought to follow. After stating, as Peter did, the great facts of the gospel, and calling upon all who hear and believe to put themselves immediately under the government of the Messiah, all who avow themselves believers in Jesus, are to be immersed without delay, and added to the churches nearest them already congregated; or if there are no such churches at hand, these young converts are to be gathered together as a church, and not be left as defenceless sheep in the wilderness. Such scenes as this ought frequently to appear in the meeting houses of the churches, when the gospel is professedly preached to men yet in their sins.

WM. BALLANTINE.

Camden, N. J. May 29th, 1835.

Letter from Elder William Jones.

No. III.

LONDON, April 29, 1835.

My dear brother Campbell!

I WROTE to you under date of the 16th of last month, by one of the packet ships from Liverpool to New York, and, by the same conveyance, forwarded you a small parcel of books to the care of Messrs. Joseph Stanley & Co., both of which, I hope, will reach you in due course. As Mr. Thomas, father of Dr. Thomas, of Richmond, in Virginia, and who resides in my neighborhood, informs me that you have had an unusually severe winter in the United States, the frost having blocked up the ordinary channels of communication, I suppose I must not expect to receive any letters from you for the next two months. Nevertheless, I purpose, if the Lord spare me, and grant me ability, to adhere to my stipulation of forwarding a letter to you monthly; for, on dipping a little further into your "Christian Baptist" and "Millennial Harbinger," I find there is no danger of my lacking materials for correspondence for many months to come, even though "stern winter" should interpose to withhold, or keep back, your letters to me.

Well, my dear friend, I have now issued from the press two numbers of *my* "Millennial Harbinger," and they have taken their flight east, west, north, and south. As they are mostly made up of selections from your "Christian Baptist," and manuscript letters, I think it

Digitized by Google

very natural for you to inquire what kind of reception they have met with among my countrymen; and to this point I shall first address myself.

It will no way surprise you to be told, that, as usual in all cases of this kind, a great diversity of opinion prevails. Some are lavish in their commendation of the productions of your pen; but I do not intend to offend your delicacy by quoting these. Applause is intoxicating to proud mortals, and few can withstand its deleterious influence; I prefer, therefore, the opposite course, namely, that of laying before you a few of the animadversions, remonstrances, and complaints which have reached me, hoping that you will take them into consideration, and where reproof and censure are well founded, allow them to have their due weight. Here, then, follows an extract of a letter, which I received, a month ago, from a correspondent who resides more than five hundred miles from the metropolis, but who had then only seen the first number of the Millennial Harbinger. Thus he writes—

"My dear sir, you must correct Mr. Campbell; he is by far too censorious as regards the views, practices, and proceedings of others, and too rash as regards his own. I shall continue to denominate myself a Baptist, a Calvinist, and a Trinitarian (to use a Scotch phrase,) in spite of his thropple [or thrapple.] He is not the first that has attempted to discard names as descriptive of parties. But in every attempt of the kind, I always fear some cloven foot to lie concealed. I shall truly rejoice if Mr. Campbell does not strike his head against some dangerous post in the rapidity of his flight. His zeal and labors are abundant; but whether his wisdom and prudence keep pace with them, seems to admit of some doubt."

This, sir, emanates, not from a light-headed Englishman, like myself, but from a sober-minded Scotchman, one of your own nation and kindred; consequently, is entitled to the greater regard. Another, from the same country, addresses me thus:—

"With regard to the 'Millennial Harbinger,' it certainly communicates much information in which I rejoice. Mr. Campbell and his friends are extremely sanguine, however, and in danger of getting into extremes. His animadversions on Mr. M'Lean surprised me much, and led me to suppose he had never seen his writings. I am glad to see that you have done justice to Mr. M'Lean in your second number, though, indeed, it is only what I expected; and my prayer is, that you may be useful to Mr. Campbell and his friends in many respects, for which I suppose there may be opportunity, as his letter in your first number, pp. 23—29, affords much ground for criticism, &c. Allow me, now that the subject is before me, to quote to you an extract of a letter written by a young man, whose father is a member of this church, and who, in his early days, attended with his father on our church meetings, though he never applied for baptism. When arrived at man's estate, he left this country for America; and, since his residence there, he thus writes to his parent.

" 'The religious part of the community here are very zealous in the propagation of divine truth. The Sabbath Schools, although

Digitized by Google

conducted somewhat different from what they are in Scotland, are numerous, and have done much good. The Tract Society is prospering; and much good has also resulted from the Temperance Societies. But these benevolent institutions do not escape the malevolence of men. If this, indeed, were confined to men of the world, or [some of] those who profess what they call the christian faith, such as the Universalists, it would be nothing strange. But the principal agent in this is a Mr. A. Campbell, a native of Scotland, the same person that debated the truth of Christianity with Mr. Robert Owen. This gentleman is opposed to Bible Societies, Sunday Schools, Tract and Missionary Societies, and other institutions for the dissemination of divine truth. He calls the whole "milking schemes," impoverishing the people and enriching a few, and describes the people as being subject to priestcraft. Selecting one or two verses, or a part of a verse, from which to discourse, he ridicules by the name of text-preaching. And not satisfied with the common version of the New Testament, he has compiled one from the labors of Drs. Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge, with notes critical and explanatory. His religious sentiments, stripping his reasoning of its verbiage, are—denying the agency of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of a sinner, [maintaining] that the bare confession that Jesus Christ is the Son of God entitles any one to christian baptism; that water-baptism is the new birth and the regeneration of the New Testament; that until a person has been thus baptized, he is a stranger to the forgiveness of sins, or the consoling influences of the Holy Spirit; but that, when he is regenerated by water, then he participates in the "times of refreshing" spoken of Acts iii. 19. For a further account of things propagated by this gentleman, I refer you to the "Millennial Harbinger, of which Mr. Campbell is editor.'" Dated *Vicksburg, state of Mississippi*, September 5th, 1831.

A third correspondent thus writes:—"I have only just got No. II. of the "Millennial Harbinger," but have not read it. Some persons allege that Mr. Campbell denies the necessity of the Spirit's influence to convert the sinner, and holds that the Spirit is given *after*, and *in consequence of*, being baptized. His illustration of baptism from the Old Testament seems to me very fanciful."

A fourth declares, that "if Mr. Campbell's notions respecting baptism and the Holy Spirit are correct, he unchristianizes all the Paidobaptists in every age and country."!

I might thus proceed with my quotations to a considerable extent; but the limits of a letter forbid further enlargement, and enough has been already adduced to lay a foundation for a few observations and reflections, which I must now submit, on one point of doctrine above alluded to, viz. the work of the Holy Spirit in the economy of human redemption. This is a most important article of the christian faith; and correct views concerning it appear to me to be essential to soundness in the doctrine of Christ, as well as real comfort and holiness in the divine life. But, upon second thoughts, I need not have said this to you, since I have it from under your own hand, that "correct views

Digitized by Google

of the office of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men are essential to the knowledge of the christian religion, as also to our enjoyment of it." *Christian Baptist*, vol. 2.

My dear friend, when the first intimation was given me, and that before I looked into your published volumes, that you denied the necessity of any supernatural divine influence to enlighten the understanding of a sinner and convert the heart to God, to produce faith unfeigned and that repentance which is unto life, such was my confidence in you, that I treated the report as a mere calumny. I could not be made to believe that one who was so very conversant with the "living oracles," and at the same time so entirely emancipated from all human systems, creeds, and confessions, had discarded a doctrine which lies at the very foundation of all true religion or vital godliness. The report, however, gained ground by currency, coupled also with another heresy, to wit, the confounding of baptism with regeneration and the forgiveness of sins. This increased my perplexity certainly, yet I was still sceptical; for I thus reasoned with myself:—Mr. Campbell has too much good sense to maintain such an absurdity as that immersion is regeneration—that the external act of washing in water renovates the heart; he must well know that men may be "baptized infidels, washed to fouler crimes," as the poet expresses it; for what better was Simon Magus, Acts viii. though immersed by an Evangelist? There must be some mistake, some misrepresentation in all this! Mr. Campbell is not the man to confound the sign with the thing signified: he well knows that immersion in water is the symbol of regeneration, or the new birth; and that it is an emblematical representation to the repenting believer of the washing away of his sins in the blood of Christ: he surely never can confound immersion with the renewing of the Holy Spirit, of which it is only the outward sign!

In this state of perplexity, I determined to have recourse to the pages of the "Christian Baptist" for satisfactory information on the subject; and was glad to find, in the second volume of that work, a series of Essays on the Office and Work of the Holy Spirit in the Salvation of Men—eight or ten in number—and in which I was exceedingly gratified at finding the subject taken up from the beginning, and pursued consecutively, step by step, with more than ordinary ability, and in a very clear and convincing manner. It gave me infinite satisfaction to find you exonerating the doctrine in question of a cart-load of rubbish, which has been heaped upon it by expositors, and commentators, and other learned Doctors in Divinity, whose lucubrations tend to no better purpose than that of involving the subject in mysticism, and hiding the simplicity of divine truth from the minds of inquirers. Agreeing as I do with you most fully that the influence of the Holy Spirit in his operations on the human mind in the work of regeneration and sanctification are wholly of a *moral* and not of a *physical* kind, I was pleased to find you, throughout these Essays, clearly maintaining this distinction, and also successfully exposing the pernicious tendency of the latter system. The question, however, was constantly before me, and uppermost in my mind,—

Digitized by Google

Does Mr. Campbell really admit the necessity of any divine influence to give the word of God its proper effect in the conversion of a sinner, enlightening the understanding, removing the obscuring film from the mental vision, and, by means of divine revelation, causing the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, as it shines in the person of Jesus Christ, to shine into the heart, and thus produce faith unfeigned? Essay after Essay I perused with intense interest and anxiety, hoping to meet with some unequivocal testimony from his own pen, which should silence all my doubts, and put the question finally to rest. But how shall I express my disappointment when I arrived at the end of the last Essay, without finding the grand point ever fairly met! My heart sunk within me, and the mortification I endured is not to be told. And is it come to this, said I, that Mr. Campbell has actually discarded from his creed a fundamental doctrine of the Gospel? Why, the denial of this tenet must necessarily affect more or less every other sentiment connected with it, particularly the nature and properties of divine grace; and it must make salvation to be of "him that willeth and runneth," in flat opposition to the divine declaration in Romans ix. 16. as well as a hundred other texts of Scripture. Well, I bless God that the Scotch Baptists on this side the Atlantic "have not so learned Christ." We have no dispute among us on this subject; the doctrine is universally recognized in all our churches, that "salvation is wholly of grace, through faith, and that not of ourselves; it is the gift of God," and comes through divine teaching. But, thought I, perhaps Mr. Campbell does not mean to deny the necessity of the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, though he has not insisted upon it where he had a fine opportunity of doing it with effect, and where, I think, he ought not to have omitted it; let me, therefore, not be too hasty in coming to a conclusion on this matter, but examine his writings more fully, and especially as I meet with many things in them, which are wholly incompatible with such an admission.

In this way I determined to prosecute my researches through the volumes of the "Christian Baptist;" and perhaps you will not be offended with me, if I here submit to you a thought which more than once obtruded itself upon me as I perused your pages. It was this: "I now perceive how it is with my friend Campbell; he has witnessed so much of the mysticism, misery, and mischief resulting from the commonly received notion of a *physical* energy exerted on the human mind, producing faith and repentance, that he never meets with that sentiment but he appears to think he sees the great Devil, and he instantly scampers out of his way as fast and as far as he can possibly get!" Now, I put it to you, is not this, or something very much akin to it, the real fact of the case?

If, now, you are desirous of knowing what it is on which I found my judgment of you as above expressed, I will here declare it. I plainly perceive that when the Scripture doctrine concerning the work of the Holy Spirit is laid before you, it meets your cordial concurrence and approbation. We are furnished with a notable instance in proof of

Digitized by Google

this, in the fifth volume of the "Christian Baptist." A correspondent, under the signature of PAULINUS, had read your nine Essays on the Office of the Holy Spirit, to which I have above alluded, and it is obvious that he had perused them with similar impressions and feelings as myself. He was pleased with your discussion, as far as you carried it; but was compelled, like me, to regard it as defective, or falling short of a full and explicit statement of the doctrine. He, therefore, very properly handed you two additional Essays, to supply your deficiencies in this instance; and I honor you for your candor in laying them before your readers unhesitatingly. Nay, you have done more; you have given your unqualified approbation of them, in words which I rejoice to quote. "The readers of the Christian Baptist," say you, "are, and no doubt will feel themselves, indebted to Paulinus for the very forcible and elegant Essays he has furnished on this subject. He has unquestionably thought very closely, examined the Scriptures very fully, and has arranged and exhibited the testimonies in so methodical and forcible a manner, as to give the greatest and best possible effect to his sentiments on this theme. Few of the intelligent readers of this work will dissent from his conclusion of the whole matter, viz. 'The substance of the leading sentiment maintained in these two Essays, is, that we are dependent on the influence of the Holy Spirit to render the word effectual to our conversion and final salvation.'" And to this you yield your entire concurrence; for you immediately add, "Let no man say that in explicitly opposing [the common notion of physical operations,] we argue that men are converted without the Holy Spirit. By no means. The Spirit of God works upon the human mind, as well as dwells in it. It dwells in the record which God has given of his Son, as the spirit dwells in the body of a man; clothed with this record, it enlightens, convinces, and converts men. *They are enabled to believe by the Holy Spirit, and without his aid no man ever could have believed in Jesus, as God's own Son:*" which, in fact, is only saying with the Apostle Paul, "No man can say that Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy Spirit:" 1 Cor. xii. 3. I cannot help remarking, however, that you have no sooner done this, than you instantly turn round and commence a chase upon the popular doctrine concerning regeneration without the instrumentality of the word of truth, as though the clear exposition and steady maintaining of the necessity of the Spirit's teaching led persons to that mistaken sentiment—a very needless caution in my opinion. Here, then, I trust we are cordially agreed; divine influence is necessary to give the word of the truth of the gospel its saving efficacy upon the mind of a sinner. No one understands the Father's testimony concerning his Son but as taught by the Holy Spirit, or believes it but by his persuasion, or obeys it but through his power and energy; and in every instance of conversion "the arm of the Lord is revealed." This, then, shall suffice for an answer to all the idle tales that are current about your denying the work of the Holy Spirit.

Now, my dear friend, I wish you to observe, that I have no quarrel with you about the unscriptural tendency of the commonly received

Digitized by Google

notion of a *physical* operation of the Spirit working something that is called faith in the sinner's mind, without the word. I give up all the abettors of this doctrine into your hands defenceless; but I deeply regret that the scriptural doctrine concerning this important subject is kept so much out of sight in your writings. You cannot say that it forms that prominent station in them that it does in the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles. But why is this? If it be an article of revealed truth, why do you hesitate to bring it forwards, and insist upon it as the truth of God?

While glancing an eye over your pages of the "Christian Baptist," I was not a little surprised to find you classing your own countryman, R. S., the author of "Letters on Theron and Apasio," among the advocates of a *physical* energy on the human mind in producing faith, regeneration, repentance, &c. Upon what grounds or authority you do this I am at a loss to conceive. I thought I had made myself acquainted with that writer's sentiments, forty or fifty years ago; and though I have seldom looked into his volumes during the intermediate space of time, the impression upon my mind was that you were in error; and to satisfy myself, I, last evening, took down from the shelf Vol. II. of his "Letters," and there read as follows:—

"The popular doctrine supposes that unbelievers may be seriously engaged in praying for the Holy Spirit to help them to faith, and exhorts them accordingly; which is as absurd as to suppose that a man may be desirous of being influenced by the spirit of a truth, which at present he neither believes nor loves. For I reckon it must be granted, that no man loves the gospel before he believes it; and likewise that *the Spirit of God acts as the soul, sense,* or *meaning of the words wherein the gospel is delivered.*"—"The Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of Truth, as also the Spirit of Grace. He speaks and breathes only the grace and truth that came by Jesus Christ. *There is no separating the agency of the Holy Spirit from the knowledge of the truth.* To know the truth is eternal life; and this life is begun and supported by the Spirit of Christ. On the other hand, all who resist the truth, and do not admit its evidence, are expressly said to resist the Holy Ghost. We ought not, then, to imagine, with the popular preachers, that the Gospel can in any respect be considered a dead letter, or destitute of divine power. For, being the voice of God, it is unchangeably powerful to save all who believe it, and to destroy all who oppose it." *Letter V.*

Now, sir, I appeal to you, wherein do these sentiments differ from your own? I could produce twenty pages from the same volume to the very same purport, were it necessary; but I shall content myself for the present with one extract more. I know not whether you will agree with it in all respects; but if you do, it may go far to dissipate the objection raised by one of my correspondents, in a former part of this letter, viz. that you "hold that the Spirit is given after, and in consequence of, being baptized"—for this is certainly true in a certain sense, and I was surprised at the objection coming from the quarter it did.

Digitized by Google

"The Spirit of the Truth," says the author above quoted, "is first found of them that seek him not, when men, in the course of their alienation from God, are surprised and overcome by the evidence of the truth. The same Spirit, acting as the Comforter, is given only to those who are already the friends of Christ, obeying his commands, to assure them that they are his friends. To this purpose PAUL says, Gal. iv. 5. "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father."

"The Holy Spirit then acts a two fold part, as he breathes in the gospel: he reconciles enemies, and he comforts friends. And in either case, he speaks not of himself, but he glorifies Christ. He never speaks one word or sentence to any particular person, beyond what is written in the Scripture; nor does he ever apply to any person's case, any written sentence, unsuitably to the genuine scope of all the Scriptures. In reconciling enemies, he acts as the soul of that Truth which opens at once a door of reconciliation for the most wicked of mankind, and has no respect to any difference or distinction among them. In the latter case he acts as the soul of those consolatory sayings which Christ left behind him on the earth, before he ascended to heaven, and by which he proposed to correspond with his friends, in his absence from them. And who can think it incredible that God should thus correspond with men? May not the Deity correspond with men by means of the words of a written book now, as well as he did by various other signs of old? Yea, nothing is more common, than for men to communicate their temper and spirit to each other by speech or writing."

I have already extended this letter to an inconvenient length; but, *Deo favente*, I shall resume the matter next month, and finish what I have further to say on this topic. It always distresses me when I find sentiments and opinions attributed to an author which he did not hold. The thing is of pernicious consequence, inasmuch as it tends to mislead inquirers after truth, and so far contributes to support and maintain the cause of error and darkness in the world, in which, I greatly mistake your character if it be the object of your labors to assist!

Believe me, with unfeigned regard,
Your faithful and affectionate friend,
WILLIAM JONES.

Postscript.—The preceding pages make their appearance in *my* Millennial Harbinger, No. 3, and I hope you will give them a place in yours also. In addition to what I have already said, I may add, that we are beginning to make a stir among the religionists in this country, and shall, I trust, through the blessing of God, eventually do some good. Our churches take a lively interest in my publication, and by getting extracts from your essays and letters inserted in the provincial newspapers, are making it generally known.—Within the last week I find insertions of this kind in the *Scotsman*, an Edinburg journal, of high character, and much read throughout Scot-

Digitized by Google

land—in the *Brighton Herald*, (south of England,) and in the *Jersey Herald*, one of the channel islands—also, Nottingham, Bath, &c.

Our national affairs are in a critical state, and I have had my fears of late that we should have a convulsion, owing to the King, influenced by court intrigue, dismissing the Whig Ministry, the advocates of reform, in a very summary manner, and replacing them with the Tories, the friends of the bishops and aristocracy. The latter dissolved the Parliament, throwing the Empire into a state of vast excitement—interrupting trade and commerce—and souring men's minds.

The new Parliament met in February, and made loud professions of reform—but were outvoted on every important measure; and their opponents having brought forward a proposition for doing away with the sinecure church establishment in Ireland, which the Tories wished to preserve, the parties came to issue—the friends of reform triumphed—and the Tories abandoned office, 'tis thought, for ever! The Irish Church falls of course—and, according to our politicians, that of England must follow. The Clergy are become furious, particularly the privileged orders of them—and thus another signal blow has been given to the Hierarchy, which now totters to its base; thanks to the King of Zion!

Since I last touched upon the subject, I have learnt two additional churches in our denomination—one at *Sunderland*, consisting of 80 to 100 members, organized with its bishops and deacons—the other at *Houghton-le-Spring*, in the county of Durham, consisting of 16 members, with one Elder, (formerly a Clergyman of the Church of England!) both churches *strict Baptists*. I take for granted that scraps of intelligence of this kind are acceptable to you!

Vale! Vale! W. J.

Letter to Elder William Jones.

No. VI.

Much esteemed and beloved brother Jones,

YOURS of the 20th April lies before me. I thank my heavenly Father and you for its contents. Before I particularly notice them, I proceed to the unfinished items in your last.

From the explanations tendered in my Letter, No. 5, I may be permitted to state some of the distinguishing features of the reformation we plead without the imputation of vain glorious boasting.

1. Faith, as universally confessed, is essential to the salvation of the soul—testimony essential to faith—fact essential to testimony. Therefore, *all true religion is founded upon fact.* The facts found in the divine testimony are, therefore, to be distinguished from all the speculations, abstractions, reasonings, and opinions of men, as the foundation of true religion—of right affections—and of church union, communion, and co-operation. This cardinal point in our system of

Digitized by Google

reformation relieves primitive christianity from the ponderous impositions of human speculations and traditions found in the homilies, creeds, and commentaries of fifteen centuries—from all the debates and strifes about words and doctrines—and introduces a change in the whole course of religious instruction, as new and striking as was the Baconian philosophy, when first applied to the dogmas of the schools, founded on the oracles of Plato and Aristotle.

Revelation itself is founded upon fact, and therefore there is not in all its rich and varied contents one abstract proposition. The most cardinal of all the questions in moral science, viz.—"*Is there a God, or is there not?*" is not so much as once proposed in all the sacred writings. The proposition is no where offered; nor any thing which philosophers would call a proof or demonstration of it. Facts are stated; and these are left to speak for God. Thus God and man are both known by what they do and what they say: for, with us, *facts* are things done, whether done by the simple volition, the word, or the hand of an operator. By his works and by his word God is known.

The Christian facts, found in the testimony concerning what Jesus did and said, are the basis of the Christian religion. These facts, stated, proved, and illustrated, is the whole business of preaching and teaching. 1 Cor. ii. 5. xv. 1, 2, 3, &c. Each of these facts has a moral influence, or is itself a moral seal, which, in the hands of God's Spirit, delineates the moral image of God upon the human heart and character.* I need not detain you by expatiating on the great change such a view of the gospel will necessarily introduce in addressing mankind; nor how by displaying them it simplifies the Christian religion to the apprehension of all; and, most of all, redeems the church from the eternal confusion of jarring doctrines and dogmas about the most recondite abstractions, which can neither illuminate the understanding nor warm the heart; but, on the contrary, create all the strifes and debates which alienate and divide the professors of the faith.

2. Consequently, in order to baptism, nothing is to be asked for but a cordial avowal of faith in Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah the Son of God. This man "believes in his heart to righteousness," and "*confesses with his lips to salvation.*" This is the only confession of the faith which the Constitution of the Kingdom of Heaven authorizes as prerequisite to the one immersion: for Jesus pronounced Simon Peter *blessed* when he first made it; and assured him that on this foundation, as on a rock, he would build his church; and, built on this rock, the gates of hades cannot prevail against it. Matt. xvi. 13—19.

3. The only bond of union, or covenant in a church of Christ, which can secure peace and love, and which will embrace all the citizens of Christ's kingdom, is deduced from these premises. It is Peter's confession of the faith, as above expressed—immersion *into* Christ on said confession, according to Peter's Pentecostian sermon—and obedience to all the things enjoined by the King himself, in the

* *See a better illustration of this leading point, Mill. Harb. vol. 1, page 8.—The Confirmation of the Testimony, vol. 4, p. 340—343.*

Digitized by Google

Apostles' doctrine, irrespective of all private opinions, interpretations, and articles of belief, however sincerely held or honestly expressed.

From the discovery that revelation and religion are founded upon facts, these and many other useful corollaries are evidently deduced. This, moreover, opens the way for the union of all christians on the true catholic grounds on which the primitive church was founded. And should ever Christ's watchmen see eye to eye, and all christians form one communion on earth, it is to be expected only on this view of the matter. Opinions, and neither faith, nor reason, nor religion, produce almost all the divisions of christendom, and are the great obstacles in the way of effort to convert the world.

4. A distinguishing attribute of the reformation which is now plead in America, is not only the renunciation of all the scholastic words and phrases—the Babylonish dialect of the dark and corrupt ages, found in the vocabularies of theological schools, comprehending all the technicalities of orthodoxy, heterodoxy, &c. &c.; but in adopting this cardinal maxim, 'CALL BIBLE THINGS BY BIBLE NAMES.' Our experience and observation warrant the conclusion, that if the word is not in the Book, the idea which it exactly represents in theological currency is not found in the Book. This, indeed, makes bold inroads upon the consecrated style of the age; but, really, it is like the pruning knife in the hand of a skilful vine dresser: it lops off an immense exuberance of fruitless boughs, which, in addition to their own sterility, so shade and obscure the fruitful branches, as greatly to depreciate and diminish the vintage. Of what use, may I ask, have been the following consecrated words and phrases?—'The Holy Trinity—Three persons of one substance, power, and eternity—Co-essential, consubstantial, co-equal—The Son eternally begotten of the Father—An eternal Son—Humanity and divinity of Christ—The Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son—God's eternal decrees—Conditional and unconditional election and reprobation—God out of Christ—Free-will—Liberty and necessity—Original sin—Total depravity—Covenant of grace—Effectual calling—Free grace—Sovereign grace—General and particular atonement—Satisfy divine justice—Reconciled God—Active and passive obedience of Christ—Common and special operations of the Holy Ghost—Imputed righteousness—Inherent righteousness—Progressive sanctification—Justifying and saving faith—Historic and temporary faith—The direct and reflex acts of faith—The faith of assurance, and the assurance of faith—Legal repentance—Evangelical repentance—Perseverance of the saints, and Falling from grace—Visible and Invisible church—Infant membership—Sacraments—Eucharist—Consubstantiation—Church government—The power of the keys,' &c. &c. &c. Have they not generated folios of the most verbose controversy, without converting a single sinner to God, or comforting the heart of any saint on earth or in heaven?

'Concerning these, and all such doctrines, and all the speculations and phraseology to which they have given rise, we have the privilege neither to affirm nor deny—neither to believe nor doubt; because

Digitized by Google

God has not proposed them to us in his word, and there is no command to believe them. If they are deduced from the Scriptures, we have them in the facts and declarations of God's Spirit; if they are not deduced from the Bible, we are free from all the difficulties and strifes which they have engendered and created.'†

Purity of speech must precede purity of faith, and purity of faith must precede permanent union among christians. Union in truth is the only union for which christians can pray and labor. We, therefore, make purity of speech an essential item in the current reformation. When we cease debating about scholastic and barbarous terms and phrases, and learn to speak of Bible things in Bible words, we shall soon learn to think the same things, as far as union of sentiment is desirable. For my part, I do not think that identity of *opinion* is desirable among christians, any more than identity of color, pronunciation, or expression of countenance. There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one hope—as there is one body, one Spirit, and one God and Father of all—but many opinions. These many opinions are as essential to social relations in this life, as one faith to one religion.

Let me now inform you, that at this point of my present communication, I have received the March and April numbers of *your* Millennial Harbinger, and have been so much delighted and refreshed by them, that I scarcely know how to express my gratitude to the Father of mercies for the kind providence which has thus brought us together and sent us out through the British Empire in one and the same vehicle. The Lord be praised for this gracious interposition in behalf of the common salvation, and the restoration of the original gospel and order of things in the bosom of the most intelligent Empire in the world! May an abundant harvest of the rich fruits of God's Spirit reward your zeal and diligence in the Lord!!

From the great variety of the extracts you have given to England and Scotland in the two first numbers, I see it is altogether unnecessary for me to proceed farther in the specifications of the distinguishing characteristics of the reformation now plead in America. The intelligence and good sense of your readers, from the documents you have laid and are laying before them, need not be anticipated by our deductions for them. They will soon discover all the prominent and emphatic views inculcated by us; and I greatly prefer that they should approach the subject in the same manner the Americans have done—*by a gradual developement.*

Although the items of the gospel of God our Saviour are all acknowledged by all sects—such as the gospel facts, faith, repentance, reformation, baptism, remission of sins, the Holy Spirit, sanctification, the resurrection, eternal life; yet we all know that these matters may be variously arranged, and presented in different attitudes more or less striking to the mind; and all that we can say for ourselves on these topics, is, that we prefer the New Testament order and arrange-

† These quotations I have made from a book which I published last winter, called "*Christianity Restored;*" a copy of which, in sheets, I forward by this mail.

Digitized by Google

ment to every thing in the world. We boast of no new discovery of truths entirely unknown or unacknowledged before. All precious truth is as old as the first century of the Christian Era. If we understand the words or things more or less clearly than our brethren in other countries, it will soon appear to themselves without our telling them of it. Permit me only to add, at this time on this theme, that if the christian world is to be morally elevated, healed, and restored to the primitive standard, it must be effected either by the discovery of some new truths, long lost; or by placing old truths in a new attitude to the mind; or by some new dispensation from heaven. We incline to the conclusion most favorable to the setting of the old gospel in its proper light, which, in this age, would be a new light to the great mass of professors—and so new is it to many of the Rabbins and devout partizans of human creeds, that they suppose it to be a new gospel.

Correct views of the gospel facts; of the import and confirmation of the testimony of God; of faith; a change of heart, or repentance; of a change of life, or reformation; of christian baptism; of justification, or remission of sins; of the influence of the Holy Spirit in convincing the world of sin, righteousness and judgment, and of animating and sanctifying the children of God; of the chistian hope, &c. are, and have long been, the burthen of our labors. We think we have made some proficiency in these things from our long and most devout attention to God's Book; and that we have been enabled to place the christian facts—the testimony of God, faith, reformation, regeneration, remission of sins, holiness, the work of the Holy Spirit, and the future hope of christians, in a more clear, comprehensible, and intelligent light, than we have found them in any party, or in the standard of any party in christendom.

But while we honestly and conscientiously thus avow our convictions, we thus offer them to the examination of our brethren and the public; demanding of them no implicit reception or acknowledgment of them, but requesting them to search and see whether these things are so.

Our views of the Holy Spirit's work in the salvation of man, have attracted more attention, occasioned more slander, misrepresentation, and debate, than any other item, not excepting baptism for the remission of sins, as preached by Peter on the day of Pentecost. This, too, I perceive, occupies an important place in your letter before me. If, as you say, the Scotch Baptists have no dispute on this subject, they cannot have so much light upon it. We have had much debate on every item of the popular doctrine. No one Protestant tenet has been received or taught by us without discussion. We take nothing upon trust. We hold no view so sacred as not to be examined; and we find that in all the churches of the reformation in the ratio of their discussions and examinations are they intelligent on all christian topics. Knowledge, indeed, is not goodness; but christian knowledge is essential to christian goodness. It is, however, but the means: and it does not always appear that there is a necessary connexion between

Digitized by Google

even the most correct knowledge and goodness. "Knowledge puffs up, but love builds up." However, knowledge next to goodness, and especially when perfected in goodness, is one of Heaven's best gifts to man.

We have been compelled to examine this subject more than any other, because the doctrine of American Revivals, so rife since the year 1734, has made Methodists of all the Protestants in America, except a few genteel Episcopalians, whose love of good breeding, more than their knowledge of the gospel, has prevented them from screaming, swooning, fainting, jerking, laughing, shouting, under "the influence of the Holy Ghost," as they express it.

The article on American Revivals, in your April number, from the "Baptist Magazine," from the pen of Joseph Clarke, is modest enough on the fanaticism of our great revivalists. It tells only some of the truth; but he assures the English Baptists that "revival meetings may do for America, but they will not do for England." I could tell a tale that would make the ears of a Scotch and English Baptist tingle; but I forbear. Suffice it, that American Baptists and Presbyterians, with a few exceptions, and all the New Lights of every name and party; are much more enthusiastic than the Wesleyan Methodists of England, and no better read in Old Testament or New. Camp meetings is the order of the day among Regular Baptists, Calvinists, Fullerites, and all; New School Presbyterians, Cumberland Presbyterians, Christ-ians, and Methodists, Old School, New School, and no school. I object not to a camp or field meeting, a one day, two day, or seven day meeting, as such; but you understand that "*camp* meeting" means not merely hill or dale, field or forest meeting; but a meeting *for a revival*—for deducing fire from heaven—for altars, anxious seats, mourning benches, and all the machinery of "getting religion" by animal excitement.

My dear brother, the half has not been told you of what I have seen and heard, Tens of thousands in America have got a religion by "the baptism in fire of the Holy Ghost," who, if eternal salvation depended on it, could not tell where Jesus Christ was born, where the gospel was first preached, or what the gospel means. Myriads, too, have held this religion for a year, who, at the end of it, could not tell who wrote the Acts of the Apostles, or the design of that book. I should not be believed were I to tell half of what I know of the ignorance of the Book in this religious, enthusiastic, and fanatical population. "The preaching of the Holy Ghost," instead of preaching Christ crucified, buried, risen, glorified, is the chief cause of this.

We have got four kinds of operations of the Spirit in America—physical, metaphysical, spiritual, and moral. I have been represented as committing blasphemy against the Holy Spirit; as denying the Holy Spirit; as preaching a spiritless religion—because I teach that the Spirit of God only now operates through the written word, either in convincing sinners or in consoling saints. Your quotations from Mr. R. S. very nearly and very happily express what I have learned from the Book on that subject, though I dissent from other views

Digitized by Google

found in the same writer on the same subject. His views of sovereignty in the production of faith, differ nothing from physical operations in the practical tendency of both doctrines. He says, (vol. 2. London edition, 1768, p. 191,) "Two men may be employed with equal diligence in studying the Scriptures, and with equal seriousness in praying for divine assistance: the one may come to know the truth, and the other may grope in the dark all his life time." Grant it: then why is this so? "Faith comes not by any human endeavors, or the use of any means, even under the greatest advantages that men can enjoy; but of that same sovereign good pleasure which provided the grand thing believed." p. 166. "How is faith obtained? This I would answer by putting another question: How have the most remarkable discoveries that have served most for the accommodation of human life, been obtained? Has not that Providence, which continually watches over the life of man, prevented human skill and industry in giving the first hint of these? I have been told that the polar direction of the magnet obtruded itself on the first discoverer, when he was in quest of no such thing, being occupied in some very different inquiry," &c. &c. p. 163.

For these and many such sayings, to which I have not leisure to refer, I have regarded the author of the "Letters on Theron and Aspasio" as physical in his views of the production of faith as any of the populars; though at other times he says most excellent things of both the word and the Spirit of God.

But to return: Though I believe as firmly in the person and work of the Spirit of God, as in the divine person and work of the Lord Jesus—to us, "the true God and the eternal life"—as I do in the person and work of the Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: although I believe that the Spirit of God is now the Spirit of Christ, and the gift of Christ, and the author of all spiritual conceptions, feelings, and desires in us; yet I must write and speak of the popular notions of conversion, regeneration, and spiritual operations as preached and taught by most of all parties, and authors, Scotch, English, and American, that I have seen, as I have done in the volumes of the Christian Baptist and the Millennial Harbinger.

Where the word, the written word, has not come, has not been heard or preached, there is not one spiritual idea in the human mind. By this word, and in this word, the Spirit works; and, without it, he works no good view, feeling, or desire in any human being. As all the influence which my spirit has exerted on other spirits, at home or abroad, has been by the stipulated signs of ideas, of spiritnal operations, by my written or spoken word—so believe I that all the influence of God's good Spirit now felt in the way of conviction or consolation in the four quarters of the globe, is by the word written, read, and heard, which is called the Living Oracles.

Calvinists and Arminians, after sailing round the world, back to back, meet face to face in their notions of spiritual operations. The Calvinian theory makes faith dependent on a special call or visit of the Spirit; and the Arminian theory makes the descent of the Spirit

Digitized by Google

indispensable to true faith, some way enabling the sinner to believe. All human systems meet at last in one point; and that point, more or less, makes void the revelation of the Holy Spirit.

The folly of all theories upon abstract operations of the Spirit, may, I think, appear to all persons of reflection, from the concessions of all parties, which you may find frequently alluded to in our volumes. *The belief of a positive, direct, or abstract operation of the Spirit is not necessary to such operation.* If the operation be sovereign and abstract, it matters not whether it be believed or not; for neither belief, nor the want of belief, can, on the popular notion, secure or prevent such operation.

A correspondent, whom you may read in the present number, presents the same view in the form of a question:—"Is the belief of an abstract or direct operation of the Holy Spirit necessary in order to such operation? Answer *Yes*, or *No*. If the answer is affirmative, then the doctrine of abstract influence is exploded; for then is the operation *through faith*, and not without it. If the answer is negative, then why preach the necessity of believing in such operations, as the Spirit operates savingly without such belief?"

But of this, if required, I shall be more in detail hereafter. Meanwhile, I pray you excuse the desultory character of this communication. It was written midst unfavorable circumstances.

In all affection, for the truth's sake, and in the hope of immortality, ever yours, A. CAMPBELL.

To Dr. James Otey, Bishop of Tennessee.

Letter IV.

MY DEAR SIR,

I CANNOT sufficiently express my admiration of the candor and good sense of Dr. *Onderdonk*, displayed in this truly rare acknowledgment among episcopal writers on the claims of their own episcopacy—viz. that "*no argument is worth taking into the account* that has not a palpable bearing on the clear and naked topic—*the scriptural evidence of episcopacy.*" p. 3. This just and magnanimous disclaimer of all "*the traditions of the elders*" refutes more than ninety-nine hundredths of all the defences of prelacy and diocesan episcopacy written since the days of Cranmer. It cuts to the very core Dr. Cooke, Mr. Chapman, and all that class of writers who depend so much more upon the primitive fathers and the first four general councils, than upon "the scriptural evidence of episcopacy." Their arguments, in your judgment, Dr. Otey, and in that of Dr. Onderdonk, "ARE NOT WOHTH TAKING INTO THE ACCOUNT." May I not, then, be excused for even not making an effort to show that the arguments deduced from the primitive fathers, are by, and of themselves, wholly inconclusive, and, at all events, a sandy foundation on which to rest one of the essential attributes of a true church, which, as all agree, consists in having all the *divine* ordinances truly and

Digitized by Google

authoritatively administered? As our learned and candid Bishop has taken all this labor off our hands, I cannot but return him my sincere thanks; and, therefore, until I hear from yourself, Dr. Onderdonk, or some other new and able advocate of diocesan episcopacy, I shall hold all such arguments as wholly "extraneous things," and "not worthy to be taken into the account" in deciding the claims of episcopalian bishops; for our author declares in the first paragraph of his tract, that, destitute of scriptural evidence—of "the authority of Scripture—*it is not necessarily binding*."*

The following passage from the tract shall constitute the text for our present letter:—

"Passing by the feeble claim of lay-ordination and a lay-ministry, which, we suppose, will scarcely pretend to rest on either scriptural command or example, we consider this issue as between two systems only—episcopacy, and parity or the Presbyterian ministry.† Parity declares that there is but *one order* of men authorized to minister in sacred things, all in this order being of equal grade, and having inherently equal spiritual rights. Episcopacy declares that the Christian ministry was established in *three orders*, called, ever since the apostolic age, Bishops, Presbyters or Elders, and Deacons; of which the highest only has the right to ordain and confirm, that of general supervision in a diocese, and that of the chief administration of spiritual discipline, besides enjoying all the powers of the other grades. The main question being thus concerning the superiority of Bishops, and the rights of the next order being restricted only so much as not to be inconsistent with those of the highest, we need not extend our investigation of Scripture beyond what is requisite for this grand point. If we cannot authenticate the claims of the episcopal office, we will surrender those of our Deacons, and let all power be confined to the office of Presbyters. But, if we can establish the rights of our highest grade of the ministry, there can be little dispute concerning the degrees of sacred authority assigned by us to the middle and lower grades. This is a further clearing of our argument, not indeed from extraneous or irrelevant matter, but from questions which are comparatively unimportant.

---

* Report has carried to my ears that Bishop Onderdonk has, by some late reviewer, been compelled to abandon, in part, the doctrine of the tract; and has taken this ground, "That the fabric of the Ministry, described by the Fathers, forms a historical basis for interpreting Scripture." I may not be correctly informed, but will soon ascertain the truth of the matter. If this should be the fact, then the key of interpretation is found in the pockets of the primitive Fathers; and the fabric of their ministry is made to explain the New Testament, which assumption will again immerse the controversy in the night of papistical antiquity, and place it on the very same foundation with the claims of the Roman Catholics: for this is exactly their ground!!

† "Other denominations besides those called Presbyterians, practise Presbyterian ordination, as the Congregationalists, Baptists, &c. The ordination also of the Lutherans and Methodists is Presbyterian, Luther and Wesley (and Dr. Coke, the source of Methodist orders in this country) having only been Presbyters."

Digitized by Google

"The main issue, then, is, whether Presbyters (or, more strictly, Presbyters *alone*) have a scriptural right to ordain, or whether the agency of a minister of higher grade than Presbyters is not essential to the due performance of that act? Whichever way this great issue be decided, all subordinate questions go with it, if not necessarily, yet because they will no longer be worth contending for, by either party."

The issue made in the above extract, however it may be disposed of, reaches not the true and main question, the previous question being, Has Jesus Christ set up a church or kingdom on earth, consisting of many small communities, under one general head or government on earth; or has he instituted a kingdom, consisting of many communities, having each its own officers, exercising jurisdiction only in the one community of which they are members? On the decision of this fundamental point mainly issues every question concerning officers, government, authority, &c. in the christian church.

The controversy between the Episcopalians and Presbyterians I am constrained to compare to a controversy in a republic between monarchists and aristocrats about their respective rights to rule the republic. The *people* care not for the issues they are pleased to make in managing the debate. They reply to all their reasonings thus:—'Gentlemen, the nature of our institution is essentially opposed to the pretensions of you all. While you are forming issues between yourselves, which of you have the best right and reason to govern us, we are examining our Charter; and we feel authorized to say, that all your aspirations and pretensions are wholly incompatible with the genius of our association. We constitutionally can recognize no authority or government over us out of our respective communities. We have one King, one Lawgiver, one Judge, one Head, who is in heaven. His Apostles inherited his Spirit, and have taught us his laws. and all we are brethren. All our communities are co-ordinate and independent of each other. Each community elects and ordains its own bishops and deacons by the authority of our King; and these bishops and deacons have no rule, authority, or power in or over any community, but in and over that which gave them office. As independent communities, components of one grand community, we co-operate not in subordination to any extrinsic general government composed of the officers of these communities, as a separate and distinct cast, class, or order of men, exercising general diocesan or synodical jurisdiction, but in subordination to our sovereign Lord the King in heaven. Our co-operation is exclusively designed for the sake not of legislation or government, but for the sake of the temporal wants and growth of the body—for the sake of communicating to the necessity of saints, and of promulging the gospel to all the world. For these two great objects we co-operate as distinct independent communities, and meet together by messengers, at such times and places as the exigencies of the brotherhood and of society at large require. But not finding in the Book any authority for stated provincial assemblies of any sort—for synods and councils in governmental matters—for diocesan bishops, or synodical courts, or general

Digitized by Google

councils, we reject them all as unconstitutional in their nature, tyrannical and oppressive in their tendencies and bearings, as the pages of universal history uniformly and constantly depose.' Such would be the issue which our views would lead us to make in any effort to decide the claims of all the clergy in all denominations in christendom.

We regard this or popery as the only cardinal question in all matters pertaining to government or jurisdiction in ecclesiastic politics. Between anarchy and despotism this is the golden mean. The more we examine the Episcopal, Presbyterial, and Methodistic plea, the more clearly we perceive their tendency to concentration, to consolidation of power, to popery, either in the person of one or thirty tyrants.

There are but two diocesses in nature or in reason—the diocess of all the world, or of one congregation. The Pope claims the former—we the latter. All between is inconsistent with reason, with scripture, with prelacy, presbytery, and methodistic superintendence. One Catholic church, one Catholic head. Two Archbishops is a contradiction in terms. There cannot be two General Assemblies, two General Superintendents, two Archbishops, any more than two Pontiffs.

But, now, my dear sir, suppose such an issue were made; (such a one has been made)—what avails the issue of Dr. Onderdonk in the passage above quoted! This, indeed, is the main question—Did the Messiah create an ecclesiastic monarchy, aristocracy, or the commonwealth of Israel? Was it God who proposed, or the people that asked, a King in the antecedent economy? Has he now (under the reign of his Son) constituted a King on earth, and a King in heaven? Is Christ's kingdom a kingdom of this world, having in it lordships, principalities, powers, and authorities legislative, judicial, and executive; or is it one great community of communities, under the direction of Apostles and Prophets, each having its own bishops and deacons, under the one Archbishop—the great Shepherd and Overseer of souls?

Dr. Onderdonk affirms in the issue which he has made with the Presbyterians, that bishops are superior in authority to elders, in that only they can ordain, confirm, exercise general superintendence, and administer the discipline of the church. In affirming this, he assumes that they are the successors of the Apostles, and, as such, possess this superiority. Of this allegation we are now to speak, having in our last disposed of an assumption so cardinal in the argument, that, with the scriptural rejection of it every plea for diocesan episcopacy falls to the ground. We shall think that that position is unanswerably disposed of, until some advocate of prelacy shows that there is some scriptural authority for the idea of succession in certain powers, and exclusive rights in one cast or line of successors originated by the Messiah.

The assumption now before us has already, indeed, been examined at considerable length in our second letter. It is this: *That Christian Bishops are successors of the Apostles*, of the original Twelve. We

Digitized by Google

have already shown that if they are successors of the Apostles in any point of superiority over the elders, or if their office is perpetual, then they are to us as the original Apostles of Christ. They are successors in every thing official or in nothing official. This, universal usage and law, sacred and political, fully sanction and ordain.

Now if it should appear that the office of Apostles has wholly ceased, no logic can show that there is any such *officer* on earth as a successor of the Apostles. Having in our second letter particularized the order of officers called Apostles, succession to whom is pleaded, we now institute an inquiry into the nature of this office.

Jesus of Nazareth was the Apostle of God the Father. The twelve appointed by Jesus, and Paul afterwards sent by him, are the only Apostles of Christ. Messengers sent by christian communities are the Apostles of churches. The Pope contends that Christ has a successor on earth as the one only Apostle of God. The Episcopalians contend that the Apostles of Christ have successors. We contend that neither Jesus as the Apostle of God, nor the Apostles of Christ, as his ambassadors to the nations, can, from the very nature of their office, have successors. There is no debate between us concerning the Pope as the successor of Jesus. The controversy is, whether Christ's Apostles could have successors. That they cannot is to us evident:—

1st. Because they were ordained to be witnesses of the sayings and doings of Jesus, and to attest his resurrection from the dead. Luke xxiv. 48. Acts i. 21, 22. ii. 32. x. 39, 41.

2d. They were ordained not only to prove that Jesus was the Messiah—that he died for our sins, was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures; but also to set up the Christian Institution, as Moses was commissioned to set up the Jewish. Hence Paul said he was ordained to be a *preacher* and a *teacher* of the Gentiles in *the truth*—one that introduced the gospel—an able minister of the New Institution—a steward of the secrets of Christ. 2 Cor. iii. 5—13. iv. 1. 1 Cor. iv. 1. &c.

Such was the office of Apostles, and for such an office their qualifications were the various gifts of the Holy Spirit—the power of uttering infallibly the oracles of God—of confirming their testimony with supernatural powers, and of imparting all spiritual gifts to others.

In all the divine records of christianity there appears no *Apostle of Christ* not gifted as above; and on earth, since their death, there never has been one such. It is, therefore, wholly out of the question for any person to claim "*apostleship*," or the office of an Apostle, in this age. There is no such office; and, consequently, no such officers. As well might any of the Captains or Priests of Israel have claimed the office of Moses, or to be his successor in office, as any living man now claim the office of an Apostle of Christ. The office of Moses, of Aaron, of the Apostles, has ceased. There is, indeed, some analogy between every ship-builder in America and Noah, and between every Bishop and Paul; but he who from analogy in official duties claims to be the successor of Paul, is not farther from the path of sober

Digitized by Google

reason and scriptural authority, than the ship-builder who claims to be a successor to Noah, and a Saviour of men, because of some resemblance between a schooner and Noah's Ark, and the use of both. Some analogy may be found between the Mayor of London and his official duties, and those of George I. but would it not be ridiculous for him to claim the office of King, and to be the successor of that sovereign because of such analogy! And what shall we say of the English and American prelates of the 19th century, who, because of their political or ecclesiastical standing, claim the office of Apostles, or to be their successors in official duties, authority, and responsibility!

To plead that there is a sort of sub-Apostles, a class of intermediates between the original Twelve and christians elders or bishops, such as those of Ephesus or Philippi, is to give up the whole matter of succession to the Apostles of Christ, and to introduce a new class; and for such an order where is the proof? 'In the office of Timothy and Titus,' says the Assistant Bishop of Pennsylvania. To the case of Timothy and Titus we shall devote our next letter. Meanwhile, I remain, most respectfully and benevolently, your obedient servant,

EDITOR.

John's Immersion---No. 2.

AT the time of the appearance of John the Immerser, the iniquities of the Jewish nation had nearly reached their grand climacteric—that critical period spoken of by Moses, and more fully as to time and circumstance, by Daniel the Prophet. Forgetful at once of the kind and tender mercies of God—of his glorious manifestations and illustrious providences, exerted and exhibited to them by so many honoring displays of his glory—the only people on this vast globe, who were blessed with the Shekinah, and who ranked highest among the multitude of nations composing the world: forgetful, we say, of all these, as well as the scenes of wrath through which their disobedience made them pass—their plagues in the wilderness—their sorrows and troubles in "the land of promise"—and their captivity by the Assyrians and Nebuchadnezzar; the wrath of God was ensuing upon them at length, to visit them for their multiplied transgressions. Confining the remark to the great mass of the nation, it is extremely doubtful whether the dark annals of pagan crime exhibit more turpitude, more debasement, more revelry in all that was horrible and disgusting—in all that was debasing and humiliating—than did the Jewish nation when John came in the wilderness, proclaiming the approaching Reign of Heaven. Overflowing with almost every conceivable form of crime—with hearts fattened with sin, as for a day of slaughter—having eyes, and seeing not—having ears, and not hearing—having minds, yet not understanding—was the character of the people to whom John was now to proclaim the speedy approach of the Lamb who was to take away the sins of the world. Speaking in the language of humanity, a more hopeless enterprize could not have been embarked in. It was one that had for its object the purification of a nation—it was a reformation that had reference to every class and grade of society—for all—high and low, the powerful and weak, teacher and scholar, priest and people, had departed from God, and deserted his ordinances. All needed purification now, for God refused to purify them by the law. All classes, we say, needed the purification spoken of by John, there was not one

Digitized by Google

in all Judea who did not, and knew the declaration of John to Jesus Christ when he came to be immersed. As his was an immersion for the remission of sins, he could not understand why Jesus, who walked in all the commandments and ordinances of God, blameless, should come to him a sinner, to be immersed for the remission of sins. But Jesus replied, Suffer it to be so, for thus it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness. Little did John expect to see the Holy Spirit descend and remain on Jesus, as they walked down into the water. It was the pleasure of the righteous God that his Spirit should descend at that time, and thus his righteousness was fulfilled.

We have said above, that God refused to purify them by the law. And to one who has not taken an extensive view of the matter, the fact that the law contained its various means of cleansing from sin, would appear to raise an insuperable objection to all the first part of our essay. For this reason we have introduced the declaration just referred to, and now sustain it by Malachi. Here is his description of the Priests at the time of John the Immerser;—"And you [Priests] say, Wherein have we despised thy name? You offer polluted bread upon mine altar; and you say, Wherein have we polluted it? In that you say, The table of the Lord is contemptible. And if you offer the blind for sacrifice, is it not evil? And if you offer the lame and sick, is it not evil? Who is there even among you that would shut the doors for naught? Neither do you kindle fire on mine altar for naught. I have no pleasure in you, says the Lord, *neither will I accept an offering at your hand.*"—"And now, O you Priests! this commandment is for you. If you will not hear, and if you will not lay it to heart to give glory to my name, says the Lord of hosts, *I will even send a curse upon you, and I will curse your blessings.*" The same Prophet furnishes a character of the people:—"Judah has dealt treacherously, and an abomination is committed in Israel and in Jerusalem; for Judah has profaned the holiness of the Lord which he loved, and has married the daughter of a strange god. The Lord will cut off the man that doeth this, the master and the scholar, out of the tabernacles of Jacob, and *him that offers an offering unto the Lord of hosts.* And this have you done again, covering the altar of the Lord with tears, with weeping, and with crying out, *insomuch that he regards not the offering any more, nor receives it with good will at your hand.*"

Such was the degraded condition of this sinful race of priests and people—the people so wicked that the Lord proclaimed that he would cut them from the tabernacles of Jacob—and the Priests, so steeped in iniquity, that he declared he would not accept an offering from them. But his goodness—his kind and tender mercies, did not desert his ancient race. From this wide spread ruin of morals and true holiness, he declares he will endeavor to raise them—once more he will make an effort before he gives them up to his promised punishment. The same Prophet continues—"Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord whom you seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom you delight in: behold he shall come, says the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? And who shall stand when he appears? For is like a refiner's fire and like fuller's soap. And he shall sit as a refiner, and a purifier of silver; *and he shall purify the sons of Levi*, and purge them as gold and silver"—[Why all this?]—"THAT THEY MAY OFFER UNTO THE LORD AN OFFERING IN RIGHTEOUSNESS." There is much force and beauty in the expression of Jesus Christ, viewed in connexion with this prophetic teaching—we allude to his declaration, "The law and the prophets were *until* John, but *since* that the Reign of Heaven is proclaimed." Until John came, the Jews received instruction from the law and the prophets, though they perverted both greatly: they looked for the remission of sins through the law, notwithstanding the priesthood was so corrupt, that God declared he would not accept an offering from them. But John came proclaiming the Reign of Heaven; a promulgation of new terms was made, terms such as the nature of the case required—such as suited the condition of both priest and people, for both were cleansed by the same act. John proclaimed as a part of the Reign of Heaven the im-

Digitized by Google

mersion of reformation for the remission of sins—thus the sons of Levi were purified, so that they could make an offering to the Lord in righteousness. We know that they were purified, because the Messiah sent many of the Jews to the Priests in his day, to make an offering to the Lord; and he would not have done so, if their offering was unacceptable to the Father. If we look at the history of the times given by the Evangelists, there will be found a complete and full picture, agreeing in its general details with Malachi. It was a generation of vipers—their minds were darkened, hearts filled with iniquity, perverse in their dispositions, blind not only to their own conceptions of the law, but also to the way of righteousness. They had departed from the law of Moses and made it of non-effect by their traditions—such as the one taught by the Pharisees, of the duty of the child to the parent, by which they were released from all ties of filial piety, by pronouncing *corban* over their property. There was, too, a spirit of detraction, defamation, and falsehood among them, that scarcely finds a parallel in this, our degenerate day. Look at the impudent reply of the Jews to the Saviour, when he told them he would make them free. They were surprised to think he should speak of making them free, *who were never in bondage to any.* Make the seed of Abraham free, indeed! Their slavery in Egypt for four hundred years was forgotten—their bondage to the Assyrians and Babylonians had passed from their minds; and at the very time they spurned so indignantly his offer of making them free men, they were under the iron hand of Roman bondage, and were actually paying tribute to the Mistress of the world.

The sins to be remitted by the immersion of reformation were committed against the law of Moses—their apostacy from the holy commandments of God, was so great, that the people with their priests were in want of cleansing before they could make acceptable offerings to the Father. Hence it is that the dispensation of John, which was continued after his death by the Saviour and his missionaries, was addressed *exclusively* to the Jewish nation. The immersion of reformation for the remission of sins, proclaimed by John, was not to cross the boundaries of Palestine. The commission runs, "Go not away to the Gentiles, nor enter a Samaritan city; but go directly to the lost sheep of the stock of Israel." The Messiah himself said, "My mission is only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Thus, having found that the Jews alone were concerned or involved in the mission of John, and the Lord of John, we are at no loss to define the nature of the sins which were remitted by obedience to the proclamation of John the Immerser. They are seen in almost every page of Jewish history—exhibiting to the attentive reader an apostacy the most wonderful in its character, the most appalling in its fruits, and terrible in its final consequences, of any yet recorded of men, with the single exception, perhaps, of our own. The priest's lips, which should have kept knowledge, were filled with bitterness and cursing—their minds were darkened by iniquity, and their understandings veiled with a triple layer of sin. Nor was the condition of the people a whit better—they were corrupt at the very fountain—they had turned aside from the law of God—from its plain and simple precepts they had strayed away—they could not hear the voice of mercy—they could not see the transcendent kindness of God their Father—but running after the broadest phylacteries, stumbled in the race, and fell. They shut up this kingdom of heaven from men, by teaching them the wrong road to it. The families of widows were devoured by them, and then long prayers were made to exhibit their love to God. The sea and land were traversed to make one proselyte to their dark and corrupt creed, to their apostacy, the principles of which once embraced, made him who received them more a child of hell than he was before. To swear by the gold of the temple was binding, but to swear by the temple which consecrated the gold was not binding! To swear by the altar binds not, but to swear by the offering on the altar, and consecrated by it, was binding! You pay the tithe of mint, dill, and cummin, and omit the important articles of the law, justice, humanity, and fidelity. You resemble whitened sepulchres, which without are indeed beautiful, but within are full of corrup-

Digitized by Google

tion and of dead men's bones. Thus you also outwardly appear righteous to men; but are inwardly fraught with subtlety and injustice.

This is a summary of the creed of this apostate race—a detail of their sins, drawn by the hand of a master—one who needed not that any should give him testimony concerning the character of men, because he knew what was in them. He could strip the borrowed cloak of righteousness from them and reveal them in all the naked deformity of sin and corruption. They were now called upon to reform—to bring forth fruits equal to their reformation, and were warned not to lay the flattering unction to their souls any longer, that they were safe, because they had Abraham to their father. If they now refused to obey John's proclamation and receive the remission of their sins by the immersion of reformation, their cup would be filled and the impending vengeance overtake them. But some one will say, 'This is giving too much importance to the mere act of immersion—it was not essential that it should be received in order to salvation.' We have proved, however, that a people was to be prepared for the Lord, by having given to them the KNOWLEDGE OF SALVATION IN THE REMISSION OF THEIR SINS, and that John proclaimed the immersion of reformation for this very remission. And now listen to the Messiah: "All the people, even the publicans, who heard John, *have, by receiving immersion from him, honored God;* whereas the Pharisees and the lawyers, in NOT being immersed by him, *have rejected the counsel of God with regard to themselves.*" What language can be more precise than this? How could the essential nature of immersion be expressed more definitely? In this declaration of the Saviour, which is as full as it can be, this non-essential "rite' of immersion is made the very groundwork of acceptance and rejection—those who received it honored God—those who scorned a "water salvation," "a gospel in the water," "a patented machine of water safety," rejected the counsel of God against themselves. The Pharisees could *not* reject John's immersion of reformation for the remission of sins, without a curse following the rejection; but now men can reject the immersion of the great Redeemer, and blessings follow it! They are honored too—but mark it, not by God, but by men.

We have thus ascertained the design of John's immersion as revealed by the Holy Spirit. It was intended that "he should bring back many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God." "Moreover, he shall go before them in the spirit and power of Elijah, to reconcile fathers to their children; and by the wisdom of the righteous to render the disobedient a people well disposed for the Lord." The manner in which this was to be done—the condition of all the inhabitants of Judea and their need of cleansing, have thus far been faithfully gleaned from the only competent witnesses. The rejection of John's immersion was a great crime on the part of the nation, and the full development of the consequences of the crime, will clear up some matters in the word of the gospel history, which have been considered very difficult heretofore. However, we must reserve this for the next inquiry which naturally follows this one—the salvation which John's disciples were to enjoy, and then we shall follow out, more in detail, some things merely hinted in this. We again appeal to the Bereans—Search the Scriptures to see whether these things are so or not.

T. S. D.

Louisville, Ky.

Reply to a Reformed Clergyman---No. 3.

BY S. M. M'CORKLE, A LAYMAN.

[CONCLUDED.]

It is a little beyond my ken to understand the true meaning of our friend in his "binding of the dragon." At one time he is quite literal; at other times he is as far on the other side. At one time he says,

Digitized by Google

"Now unless we know how much power this dragon has to deceive the nations, we cannot calculate the consequence of his imprisonment. Were I to assert that this alone is sufficient to give the gospel a triumphant spread from pole to pole in a single year," &c. Anon he says that "the dragon is a literal serpent, [devil, I suppose,] nor the angel descending from heaven a literal angel, any more than a literal throne, a literal soul, and a literal resurrection of saints literally dead." *The rest of the dead*, "the tyrants and firebrands of the earth, the spirits that supported the dragon," &c.

Now, if I understand the brother, all the scenery of this 20th Revelation amounts to this: Wicked and tyrannical governments destroyed by judgments those that have opposed the christian religion; and all government placed in the hands of saints, men who will with all their power facilitate the spread of the gospel. The following quotations are to this point: "From heaven the power descends, the judgments of God, the vials of his wrath accompanying the proclamation of the apostolic gospel, as the miracles of that age accompanied the preaching of the Apostles. This combination of physical and moral means seems all sufficient not only for the imagery of the vision, but also for the work to be done."

Now, according to our friend's theory, the world is to be evangelized by the proclamation of the gospel and judgments combined. Where is your "thus saith the Lord" for this? There is not a condition, not an overture of grace, not an offer of mercy, salvation, or pardon accompanying one single judgment, or one vial of wrath, recorded in the Revelation of John the Apostle. There is nothing but *pestilence and war* until the whole scene is consummated—until the destroying angel has completed his dreadful work of death upon corruption. No scripture support can be brought to the theory; it must be a new revelation, an entirely new gospel, unknown before the 'power descends from heaven." In the last judgments which closed the existence of the Jewish church, there was no repentance, no reformation; their wickedness increased with their sufferings. So, in our opinion, will it be with a great proportion of the present Gentile church; and such the facts, predicted in the Apocalypse, that register of tremendous events.

We will now examine our friend's "rest of the dead, the tyrants and firebrands of the earth, the spirits that supported the dragon, revived not again till the thousand years were expired." Now, sir, is the spirit of the martyrs extinct? Is the spirit that persecuted them extinct? Are the spirits that supported the dragon to become extinct before the binding of the dragon takes place? One plain negative answers all these questions. Then with what propriety are they called dead while living? With what propriety are the words "rest of the dead" used at the time the scene relative to them is being acted, if they were not previously dead? "Rest of the dead" is nothing more than a simple contrast between a certain part of mankind who had not suffered martyrdom, and those who had. This is a plain common sense exposition of the passage; and God never pro-

Digitized by Google

poses any thing to the faith of man contrary to common sense. Now, brother, when is this "rest of the dead" to die? Make it the spirits that supported the dragon, and you must make the death take place at, or after, the binding of satan; it cannot be before: for the "tyrants and firebrands," the spirit of persecution, has lost but little of its strength, still alive, and still like to be.

Farther, it is said, "Blessed and holy is he that has a part in the first resurrection!" Now is this spoken in reference to the living or the dead? It must be spoken relative to that which is to be resurrected—the dead. Now if literal men are not to be resurrected, how will you bless principles or qualities abstract from men? There is something in your system here which will not stand the scrutiny of common sense. It would be nothing short of an absurdity to say, 'Blessed and holy is holiness, hope, charity.' Or what will you make out the spirit of the martys to be?

I see no alternative. Our friend's theory of his resurrected, and non-resurrected spirits, firebrands, &c. must "go by the board."

A fate but little better awaits his "new dynasty of the saints, sitting on all the thrones of all the nations of the world."* Woe to the world in the day of their coronation, if they be not a different race of saints from those commonly made now-a-days. Are they to be infallible, incapable of erring? or are they to have the common infirmities and weakness of human nature? Is inspiration to dwell in them—decide in all their decisions? How are their decrees to be executed upon offenders—by the hand of man, or by the physical hand of Omnipotence? How are these thrones to be filled, when by death or otherwise they are made vacant—by election, or hereditary succession? Is renovated christianity to be better than primitive? Will our friend tell us how long before the election of even bishops was attended in olden times with tumult and blood?

The first christian emperor established a human creed by civil authority, and no doubt contributed much toward the birth of the son of perdition. Is there to be no heresy in the "new dynasty"? By what means is it to be put down? You need not dream of putting error down by argument: fire and faggot have been found far more potent: by it has the Roman church, except in a case or two, kept truth out of her dominion. Is never an Arius, an Athanasius, a Pelagius, Pope Hildebrand, Bishop Bonner, or Friar Dominic to arise in your "new dynasty"? We may safely reason from the past to the future; and safely say, without daily miraculous aid and inspiration, your "new dynasty" would soon become a reign of terror. You might as soon expect the laws of nature to change, as to expect universal peace and harmony to continue a thousand years on earth under the management of man; restless, ambitious, erring man. Good men have erred, may err, and may again fancy themselves God's vicegerents on earth, the executors of his vengeance on heresy. Man cannot govern man; he bows to no authority but that of his God, and asks occular demonstration of this.

* This reminds me of a certain "new party in politics"—a certain party which might be named—if they do not *reign* in your "new dynasty, they will not *serve*."

Digitized by Google

Our friend is to have the world kept to the right by judgments. These must be often resorted to, and will make your "new dynasty" more to be feared that loved, more terrible than glorious; you will have the obedience of slaves, not sons.

You must have an Elijah to call down fire from heaven; for judgments from a silent invisible hand will soon become familiar, will soon be accounted for on natural principles—lose their efficacy.

We have two instances of judgments in the first age of christianity. Light and motive was then sufficient to induce men to obedience. According to our friend's theory, the scourge must attend the proclamation; the gospel is to be remodelled; is to come with peace and pardon in one hand—"pestilence and war" in the other!

By bad management men have ruined the church. How will it be when the same hands have both church and state to manage? Nothing superior to the present dispensation can rise out of it. Can more be expected in the future than has been done in the past? The spirit of war is as prevalent now as it was eighteen hundred years ago; it cannot cease in as many more, under a like management. How visionary it is to expect the sword to be turned into a ploughshare under man's management; under the present order of things. Millennial perfection cannot rise out of the present dispensation; and if it were universally established on earth, it could not be preserved half a thousand years under human administration. Nothing but the presence of the King could keep an established religion from being a curse to the world. God never intended men to reign over men. There is some propriety in setting a higher order of beings to rule or reign over an inferior order; but the mind revolts at the idea of being in subjection to an equal.

Our limits will not allow us to say much about the Gog and Magog of either Ezekiel or John. If Ezekiel's be not in the future, it cannot be shown in the past; and the Prophet will have to rectify a mistake; if it does not relate to a sore trial the Jews are to undergo after their return to their own land again. According to the Prophet, the Jews are to return to their land with riches; the nations are to surround them for a spoil—for the sake of plunder. In the day of their extremity a deliverer will appear who is to turn away ungodliness from Jacob. "And his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives." With this subject is coupled matters of the greatest magnitude. The Gog and Magog of Ezekiel and John are both significant, literally significant of an army so numerous as to *cover* the land. "Thou shalt be like a cloud to cover the land;" this is the most likely meaning of the *Magog* in both places. The *Magog* of John is not the literal Magog of Ezekiel, is admitted; but is positively and literally *men*, not *spirits*.

I very well agree with our friend when saying, "No person ought to introduce the Messiah himself into a scene for which an inferior agent is quite sufficient." It cannot very well be proved that any other agent in the visible or invisible world is sufficient to bind satan, and cast him into the bottomless pit. Nor do I consider it a great

Digitized by Google

hazard to believe the descending angel to be the very Messiah. His presence alone is sufficient. There is, perhaps, more merit attached to believing than men suppose. The priests have *willed* to disbelieve the doctrine of Christ's second advent. As a matter of less hazard, the layman has *willed* to believe in his second coming. Immortality excepted, there is no doctrine for which he pleads with more devotion and greater interest. *What merit is there in believing a self-evident proposition?*

Mr. Meredith.

"MR. CAMPBELL.

"Will Mr. Campbell do us the favor to inform us, in the next number of the Harbinger, whether or not he designs prosecuting the controversy on the subject of his Extras? We wish to be decisively informed on this point, because we have been repeatedly solicited to publish the Examination in pamphlet form, and are desirous, before we comply, that the discussion should be fully concluded. Mr. Campbell will oblige us, therefore, by giving immediate attention to the above request.

"While on this subject, we would inform our readers that, although we have published every thing that Mr. Campbell has written in relation to the Examination, yet, if we except an extract from the Examination already alluded to in the Recorder, he has not published for us a single line. Even those articles which were written in vindication of our conduct, and in explanation of our views, to meet certain statements in the Harbinger, have been rejected without the expression of a reason for such rejection, or even an intimation that such articles were in existence. In truth, the course pursued by Mr. Campbell in relation to ourselves, and particularly as it regards his continued silence in respect to our replies, is calculated—we do not say intended—to make his readers believe, not only that the advantage is against us, but that we have been totally annihilated.

"For the benefit of Mr. Campbell's readers—should they ever be permitted to see what we write—we will here add, that we have done all in our power, consistently with our views of duty as an editor, to do Mr. Campbell justice and to give him satisfaction. We have repeatedly proposed to publish whatever he should write in defence of his first main position, and have made substantially the same offer respecting the whole of the Extras in question. And what we have done before we now do again. Indeed, we will do more:—for the sake of taking away every possible ground of complaint, should any such exist, we will go so far as to say that we will publish whatever Mr. Campbell will write in *defence of the Extras*, and he may choose his own order and his own mode of discussion. We are induced to make this enlarged, and, as we must think, unnecessary offer, that all may see, beyond the possibility of a doubt, if the discussion shall not

Digitized by Google

proceed, that the fault is not ours. It is to be understood, however, that our proposal is made on the condition that Mr. Campbell shall publish as much for us as we publish for him; and that he shall commence by presenting his readers with our last article on the subject. Unless he will consent to do this, we shall give the case no more of our attention. We conclude by requesting Mr. Campbell, as an act not of editorial courtesy, but of common justice between man and man, to give this article a place in the Harbinger, that all may see how the matter stands between us.—*Editor" of the Biblical Recorder.*

HAD we received the above before our Remarks on *Mr. Meredith's* last communicatio ·, published in our last number, we would doubtless have published those "certain articles written in vindication of his conduct," in reference to communications in which neither we nor our principles are concerned, and which have no more connexion with the *doctrine* of our Extras than with the doctrine of election. However, if it will be gratifying to Mr. Meredith, we will inform him, that, as soon as he has us that much in debt, we will cheerfully reprint those "certain articles."

Having now succeeded in obtaining our wishes, we will afford him line for line. Without counting, we feel quite safe in affirming that we have more than done this already. He will soon discover that we have no solicitude about letting our readers hear all he has got to say. Our policy, if policy it may be called, was to obtain from him the pledge which he has now vouchsafed. He will please remember that he issues four papers to our one, and he must not complain to his readers that we neglect him if we do not issue a Harbinger once-a-week. *Editor of the Millennial Harbinger.*

PROPOSITION.

TO save much time and money—to prevent much mistake and misrepresentation—and to enlighten the public in all the litigated questions between us and the Baptists; if all the Editors of periodicals of the Baptist denomination will select some one of the corps to write a tract of 60 or 100 pages in defence of all the points in their system, assailed by us, we will furnish the same number of pages in support of our views and in exposure of theirs; and let the two pamphlets be ever afterwards printed and bound together in one volume, without any farther controversy from the press; and let a constant supply of them be kept in all the printing-offices and book establishments under their and our influence. This will leave our periodicals open to other matters, and give to the public a fair chance of being enlightened on these subjects. We shall agree on our part to have the work stereotyped, to use all lawful and honorable means to circulate it, to be at a fair proportion of all the expences, and to sell the work at cost.

So soon as it is signified to us that this proposition will be acceded to by the Baptists, the particulars relative to the execution of this project will be submitted or received with pleasure. EDITOR.

Genuine Bombast.

"REV. J. N. MAFFIT.

"THE following description, replete with imagery of the most gorgeous character, are extracted from an address delivered by this eloquent divine, on

Digitized by Google

the recent occasion of laying the corner stone of the new Methodist church at New Orleans:—

" 'Such is New Orleans, the city within whose swelling circuit of benevolence I now stand. The din of commerce rolls along these streets by night and by day, as the voice of many waters. She sits as upon her alluvial *Delta*, and the proud deep Gulf of Mexico, like a monarch bowl at a feast, pours the rushing libations of its tides at her feet. She reaches one arm and embraces the Rocky Mountains, while with the other, she plays with the silver lakes of the North. She sends her ccuriers over the sounding seas, and every gale under heaven kisses her whitening sails, and laughs through the cordage of her laden ships!

* * * * * * * * *

" 'I strain my aching eyes to catch the far off frontiers of the Great Vale through which the Father of Waters rolls his majestic flood in turbid grandeur; but it is too far for the vision of man—I exhaust horizon after horizon, and yet the *end* is not. Thousands of miles away to the right, and to the left, I see every leaping rill that comes laughing down the sides of the mountains pointing its way laden with all that agriculture can create, or commerce ask for, towards your city. Hills as far distant from each other as the midnight from the sunrise, pay their tribute of bright waters to the ocean's eldest born, whose last deep tone of inland music rolls like the muffled drums of a solemn pageant in the ears of this vast city.' "

I know not who writes the comment above quoted on Mr. Maffit's "gorgeous imagery;" but I am of opinion that the text at least needs mending before it be held up to the youth of this country as a specimen either of *eloquent divinity* or *gorgeous imagery*.

Will the admirer and encomiast of this gorgeous imagery and eloquent divinity answer the following questions:—

1. Can a person stand within "the swelling circuit of benevolence?" Does *swelling* apply to benevolence or circuit; or is New Orleans a circuit *for* or *of* benevolence?

2. As the most majestic sounds in nature, even the voice of the Divinity, are compared to the sound of many waters, is it congruous in a Divine to compare the din of commerce to that which is the best representation of the voice of God? "Things that are equal to the same," Euclid says, "are equal to one another." Is the *din of commerce* and the *voice of God* equally sublime in the ear of the eloquent Mr. Maffit?

3. Is it not rather meagre than gorgeous imagery, to compare the proud deep Gulf of Mexico to *a bowl of punch*, or a bowl of the most delicious wine; as it is not the quality of the fluids, but the dimensions of the deep Gulf of Mexico, or rather the pouring out of its waters, that is set forth in the figure? This comparison reminds me of a swaggering youth at College, who, fond of sublime comparisons, in speaking of the wasting influence of Time, once said, "Time in its desolating march, has not only reduced the proud and splendid pillars of Egypt, but has even worn *the elbows out of my Sunday coat!*"

4. The sailor talks of the winds *roaring* and sometimes *whistling* through his cordage; but it remained for the exuberant genius of Mr. Maffit to discover that winds LAUGHED, as well as rills, when they met with ropes or pebbles.

Digitized by Google

5. Has not Mr. M. good eyes to see thousands of miles, to the right and to the left, *rills* leaping down the sides of mountains; and are not his ears exquisitely aecute to hear them laughing as they hasten down the mountains with steam-boats floating on their bosoms!

6. To say nothing of the Ocean's eldest born *creating its mother*, what means *the last deep tone of inland music?* And is not the sound of the Mississippi most sublimely compared to *the rolls of a muffled drum in a solemn pageant!!!*

Is this the gorgeous imagery or the eloquent divinity of this most eloquent of pulpit orators! 'Tis well for his admirers, and it would be well for the orator, if stenographers and printers were not admitted to report his fine speeches. But mind me, religious reader, this is the oratory of a *preacher* of what the people call *the gospel.* This is the eloquence not of the bar, nor of the forum, but of *the pulpit!*

ED. M. H.

Progress of Reform.

THE most interesting item we have to communicate is the commencement of a "*Millennial Harbinger*," by WILLIAM JONES, M. A., of London, one of the most distinguished men of the present day in the British Empire. As an Editor, he has for more than thirty years been before the English public; and occupies a very large space in the nation of authors, both for the number, variety, and value of the publications which he has bestowed upon his contemporaries and posterity. As a powerful, consistent, and laborious advocate of Christianity according to the New Testament, for many years, he is not surpassed by any one in the horizon of my acquaintance. In a former number we noticed some thirty volumes which he has published or republished within the same number of years; and now we have the pleasure to state to our readers that we have received the first two numbers of *his* "Millennial Harbinger;" the title page of which, with the contents of the two first numbers, we hasten to lay before the American public:—

"The MILLENNIAL HARBINGER, and *Voluntary Church Advocate;* conducted by *William Jones.* M. A., author of the History of the Waldences, Biblical Cyclopœdia, Lectures on the Apocalypse, Ecclesiastical History, &c.——— No. I.—March, 1835.———*Lord Jesus, may thy character open to our view, as depicted in thy doctrine, thy miracles, thy sufferings, thy death, thy resurrection, and thy glory! and then we shall not fear to put ourselves* exclusively *under thee, as our Lawgiver, our Priest, and our King.*—ALEXANDER CAMPBELL. ———LONDON: Sold by G. Wightman, and Sherwood, Gilbert, and Piper, Paternoster Row; also, by Simpkin and Marshall, Stationers' Hall Court; J. Wardlaw, Edinburgh; G. Gallie, Glasgow; J. Macdonald and G. King, Aberdeen; James Adam, Dundee; Marples & Co., and John Maitland, Liverpool; ——, Manchester; G. Bennett, Nottingham; ——, Leeds; H. Earnshaw, Colne; ——, Berwick-upon-Tweed.———*Taylor,* Printer; 119. Fleet street."

Contents of No. I—1. Introductory Remarks by the Editor; 2. Extracts from the New York Correspondence; 3. Some Account of Mr. Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, in Virginia, United States; 4. Letter from Mr. A. Campbell to Mr. P. C. Wyeth, of London; 5. Letter from Mr. James Henshall, of Balti-

Digitized by Google

more, to Mr. William Jones, of London; 6. Letter from Mr. A. Campbell to Wm. Jones; 7. Essay on the Christian Religion, by A. Campbell; 8. On the Conversion of the World, by the same; 9. On the Ancient Order of Things in the Apostolic Churches, by the same.

Contents of No. II.—1. Essay on the Ancient Order Things, (*concluded;*) 2. How is the Gospel to spread through the World? 3. On the Origin of the Christian Clergy—Splendid Meeting Houses—and Fixed Salaries; 4. Essay on Teaching Christianity, No. I.; 5. Essay on Baptism, or Immersion; 6. A Word by way of Apology for the Scotch Baptist Churches, in a Letter from W. Jones to A. Campbell; 7. Letter from Alexander Campbell to William Jones; 8. Pastoral Letter from the Presbytery of New Brunswick; 9. Retrospect of American Revivals; 10. Poetry; 11. Extract from the Baptist Magazine, Feb. 1835; 12. Dr. Beattie's Opinion of the Christian Religion.

Thus has "the sea been dried up" which separates the British Isles from America, and wings been given to the views and principles of the pleaders for the ancient faith and worship in the United States, by which they will be borne to every part of the British Empire. We shall from time to time enrich our pages with Extracts from the London *Millennial Harbinger*, and furnish our readers with the news most interesting to them, connected with the history of the progress of the Reign of Heaven, both in the Old World and the New. One or two extracts from the pages of our venerable brother Jones, will be found in the present number.

Equally disqualified for much speaking or writing, in consequence of the too great labors of the last year, and especially from having, in our late tour, greatly transcended our physical strength, in a series of speeches, of fifty-four days' continuance—we feel happily relieved from the labors of the mind and pen, by the liberal supply of excellent matter from all quarters now lying before us. It is time for us to have a respite; and while we endeavor to reinstate an enfeebled constitution for a few months, we are happy in the prospect of doing it so much to the advantage of our friends and the public.

EDITOR.

ROCKVILLE, *Maryland*, June 1835.

THE ancient gospel and a part of its wonted power has overtaken us. During the summer of the last year Thomas Jacobs and his wife (both young) came to reside in our village. He heard for the first time of a sect or party who taught that the mere water in baptism washed away sins. It was a considerable time before he obtained an interview with me; for he had heard that I was one of this obnoxious party, and that I denied the "influence" of the Holy Spirit. Finding that I denied such unfounded charges, he consented to read the "Dialogue on the Holy Spirit," (*Mil. Harb.*)—then the *Extra on Remission of Sins.* He was convinced that he should be baptized for the remission of sins. Many difficulties prevented him from obeying till the first of February last, when he and an intelligent colored man were immersed. Brother Jacobs was formerly a Radical Methodist; and a man of amiable character. Many commenced reading the Scriptures in good earnest. The principles of the reformation were discussed. A lad of about 17 years of age next obeyed, (Thomas Braddock;) then Brice Letten, aged about 60; then Joseph Braddock, brother to the former, aged about 25. He is a young man of talents, and has discoursed several times already in our meetings. He was educated for the law. About this time my son James, in his 13th year, confessed the Lord. The whole number immersed since the first of February is eleven—eight males

Digitized by Google

and three females. I think, on the whole, the principles for which we plead are spreading in our county. The last we immersed was a lady who lived at Unity, a village 12 miles distant from us. She had been driven to visit us from the misrepresentations of the Episcopal Clergyman of our village, who has one of his churches near that place. She said she must see us herself and be satisfied whether the reports she had heard had any foundation in truth.

The reformation in this section of country must of necessity progress slowly, because its principles are not understood, and because our talents are not adequate to the task of enlightening the public mind on these subjects. The *Harbinger* is not read but by a few, neither is the *Bible* studied; *Christianity Restored* has not been advertised. No proclaimer of the ancient gospel can make any headway here, if he be not a man of popular talents, so as to command public attention.

WILLIAM M'CLENAHAN.

HOLMES COUNTY, *Mississippi*, May 10, 1835.

THERE are a few persons here that have put on Christ, and are trying to walk in all his commandments and ordinances blameless. We organized ourselves into a congregation in March, 1833, taking the Word of God for our only rule of faith and conduct. Our number was nine when we commenced; but since that time it has increased to nineteen; most of them have been immersed; eight of them had been Methodists, one of them a lady of 70 years of age, who had been a member of that society for 26 years. Opposition runs high here, as in other places. The world and the sects all oppose us; bestowing on us many harsh names, such as *Campbellites*, *Infidels*, &c.; but we are still looking and praying for better times, believing that the Word of God is mighty and will prevail.

W. P. CHAMBERS.

NOTTINGHAM, Harrison county, *Ohio*, May 27, 1835.

IT is with pleasure that I embrace an opportunity to inform you that I am actively engaged (as much so as my health will permit) in proclaiming the way of life and salvation to my fellow-men. On the 14th of March last I had the satisfaction of organizing a new congregation of disciples, (thirty in number,) in Belmont county, two miles east of Barnesville, and on the 15th inst. of receiving four more, and adding them to the church organized on the preceding day.

The above named congregation is made up of individuals, sustaining not only a good moral character, but as great a weight of influence as any church with which I am acquainted. Our zealous and worthy brother John Philips, Esq. is doing much for the good cause.

ROBERT COOK.

NOTTINGHAM, Harrison county, *Ohio*, June 10, 1835.

I TAKE pleasure in informing you that the good cause of *reform* goes forward, so far as I am permitted to witness its triumphant march. On the 31st instant I had the satisfaction of adding eight respectable citizens to the new congregation in Belmont county, near Barnesville—four by immersion and four by letter, (they having been previously immersed.) The prospect for a general ingathering is truly flattering in that section of country. Lord's day, June 7, I organized a new congregation in Eastport, Tuscarawas county, of *thirty-three* members. Several have lately obeyed the gospel of the Son of God in the vicinity of Eastport. I have labored regularly there every four weeks for several months, and am just now "gathering in." O! that the harvest may prove abundant!

ROBERT COOK.

BALTIMORE, *Maryland*, May 20, 1835.

I SNATCH a moment to give you a little news. It will be brief, however, at the present. On the 26th of April I preached in Hagerstown, in the Town Hall, for the first time, and had quite a good audience. I spoke three times, and endeavored to lay before them the first principles of the reformation. I

Digitized by Google

succeeded in removing a heap of prejudice. After I had filled up the appointment in town, I went with brother Winders to Middleburg, where I spoke in a new Lutheran meeting house. I then went to Leitersburg, and so preached as to shake a goodly number of the people. Great excitement was raised here, but no clerical combats. A little rumbling was heard, like thunders at a distance; but no electric shocks. I had to hurry home on account of sickness in my family; but I did it reluctantly. Pehaps I turned my back on ten or twelve impressive requests to preach here and there. I only wish some of the Western proclaimers would turn to this corner of Maryland—they might reap an abundant harvest. As for us here, we are some of us zealous for converting men, but some of us too are not so zealous: and in this case it would gratify me to see the forest cleared by foreigners close to our well cultivated and fruitful patch. May the Lord excite some to this good work. I immersed four while I was out in the neighborhood of H. T. We have fine times here now. On last first day we received two; and brother Arny, from your office, preached at night. Afterwards father Carman gave an urgent invitation, to the delight of all the disciples. There, thinks I, bless the Lord, the veteran in the ancient order of things now unites in himself the ancient gospel and order. One came forward, and I immersed him on Monday night, and spoke on the occasion. Two more came out. After the immersion brother Farquharson spoke. And the next morning an aged man, whom brother F. has known 25 years, apprized him that he should be at the water to be immersed when the rest were. He is a good Presbyterian, 73 years of age, from Mr. Duncan's church. His daughter also, who has been some time convinced, was there; and yet another—so that instead of two, I immersed five at the Spring Gardens yesterday. May the Lord's great name be praised, and many more be saved by the gospel! Amen.

JAMES HENSHALL.

REPORT

Of a General Co-Operation Meeting, held at Deavertown, Ohio; commenced on Friday, 29th May, 1835.

BROTHER CAMPBELL,

SENSIBLE that such documents are read with little interest by many, it is not without some diffidence that we make a formal report of this meeting; but hoping our proceedings may meet the reception they justly merit, we venture to request their publication. If wrong, we hold ourselves ready to reform when made sensible of our error—if right, we hope others may profit by our example.

In the winter of 1833, brother B. Sanders, who had labored considerable in word and doctrine, laid before the congregation at Millfield the propriety of a more general or united influence of the brethren in proclaiming the gospel:—Whereupon, the congregation, on their own responsibility, sent out brother Reuben Davis, a very intelligent young man, (since deceased.) and subsequently brother John Read, to visit the several congregations in the adjoining counties; and in consequence of the faithful labors of the above named brethren, messengers from several congregations, according to appointment, met in May following. Brethren John Read and John Sargent were chosen proclaimers—immersed from 70 to 100—met again in following May: when brethren B. Sanders and J. Sargent agreed to enter the field—labored last year successfully—immersed and added about 150 disciples. Their operations expired at this meeting, where a number of messengers and brethren, whose hearts are in the reformation cause, attended. The meeting was called to order by brother B. Sanders. James Porter was chosen to preside, and Henry J. Deaver, Secretary.

First Inquiry.—Have the several congregations met their engagements in supporting those chosen to labor in word and doctrine?

Digitized by Google

A small balance not furnished—measures immediately adopted to supply the deficiency—and 300 dollars voluntarily proposed for the support of itinerant proclaimers the ensuing year.

Second.—Had the proclaimers been satisfactory in their labors and deportment?

This was promptly answered in the affirmative, and unanimously voted that a letter of commendation be given them.

Third.—Is the system of co-operation which we have adopted scriptural, or can it be superceded by any other more efficient and scriptural?

In answer to this, the beautiful figurative language of the living oracles was brought forward, in which the church of Christ is exhibited as a body composed of many members, having the same care for one another, though by no means possessing the same official capacity; therefore, as every living intelligent body is possessed of will and power, that will and power, concentrated or brought to a focus in an individual member or members, possessing the proper qualifications, certain ends are gained, without disorder or confusion in the members, seeing the will, volition, or consent of the whole is obtained; and in this view of the subject it is believed christians can co-operate and participate in proclaiming the gospel, and in this meet the approbation of the whole body, and also that of their heavenly Father. Therefore, agreed that we continue another year. Whereupon, hearing that brethren Sanders and Sargent could be obtained, they were unanimously chosen to resume their labors as evangelists again; and that for the convenience of the congregations, they be authorized from time to time to receive the contributions of the several congregations, in equal portions, according to their labors.

Appointed James D. Davis, Samuel Adams, and Henry J. Deaver, a committee to report the proceedings of this meeting to the Editor of the *Millennial Harbinger*, requesting publication.

Resolved, That this meeting now adjourn to meet again on Friday before the last Lord's day in May next, at ———.

HENRY J. DEAVER,
JAMES D. DAVIS,
SAMUEL ADAMS.

Deavertown, O. June 1, 1835.

By some inexplicable mishap, a number of letters containing intelligence of the progress of the gospel, selected for this number, have been so well laid up, that they cannot be found. One of these gave the details of a co-operation meeting at Somerset, Pa. which lasted for two or three days, at which 32 persons were immersed into the Lord. The following letter from brother Forward intimates that the good cause is still successfully plead in that region. They have appointed two Evangelists to labor in the bounds of the Somerset co-operation:—

SOMERSET, *Pennsylvania*, July 10, 1835.

SINCE I wrote you last, ten persons, having made the good confession, were baptized into Christ. This makes the late increase of our numbers here about thirty-seven. Forty have been baptized; but three, I think, were from other parts. Prospect of great accession still ahead. We are all filled with joy, and walking in the Spirit, as we trust, universally. We have a great desire to see our much esteemed father Campbell.

C. FORWARD.

A new congregation has been organized in Alleghenytown, Pa. in the vicinity of Pittsburg, which promises to do well. Father James, formerly of Fredericksburg, Va. is President of the congregation.

Digitized by Google

The London Millennial Harbinger.

AFTER a number of excellent remarks on the Kingdom of the Messiah, in full accordance with the views we have so often exhibited, the Editor concludes the article in the following words:—

"The sacred writings of the New Testament are the only standard by which we are to form our judgment of christianity, since the ascension of Jesus Christ and the decease of his Apostles. We have seen what his religion, or rather his kingdom, was, in its original establishment; and as it then appeared in its perfection, incapable of the least improvement from man, wherever we meet it in our day, we must expect to find something approximating to the primitive pattern; we shall find a company of redeemed sinners, "walking by the same rule and minding the same thing." All the true churches of Christ must have one and the same hope of their calling—one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, loving one another for the truth's sake, which is the centre of their common joy, and the bond of their union, Eph. iv. And though Antichrist, during his reign, "scattered the power of the holy people," defaced the primitive church order and worship, and trode the holy city under foot; yet, in proportion as men get emancipated from his tyrannical rule, it will manifest itself by their separating themselves to the law of their God and Saviour, and in all the affairs of Christ's house, shaking themselves loose from the doctrines and traditions of men, and taking the apostolic churches for their pattern and guide. They will hear the voice of the good Shepherd in his word, calling upon them to "stand in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls," Jer. vi. 16.

"Much has been said and written of late upon the subject of a revival of religion, particularly in the United States and Canada; and the fondest anticipations of the religious part of the community on this side the Atlantic have been called into exercise by the accounts which have reached them, from time to time, of what has been doing in that distant quarter. Volume after volume has been issued from the British press to gratify the public, and substantiate by evidence the cheering fact. The editor of this journal, in common with his countrymen, has eagerly searched those volumes, in the anxious hope of finding the various accounts of these revivals realized, or at least of finding in them something that should correspond with the first appearance of the Redeemer's kingdom in the days of the Apostles; but, with deep regret, he declares his unfeigned disappointment. This subject, however, cannot conveniently be entered upon in this place: if the Lord permit, it shall be taken up in the second number of the *Millennial Harbinger*, when their real amount shall become the subject of investigation. In the mean time, he is desirous of communicating to the religious public in this country a little information, which he hopes is not altogether devoid of interest, that has recently come across his path, in reference to the actual state of the christian

Digitized by Google

profession, in that extensive quarter of the globe—the vast continent of North America."

As it may be gratifying to our readers to have the opinions of our venerable and learned brother *Jones* on our present periodical, we shall make an extract from page 31. After speaking of the *Christian Baptist*, he says—

"The MILLENNIAL HARBINGER, edited also by *Alexander Campbell*, and published at Bethany, in the state of Virginia. This periodical, of which I am in possession of the first *four* volumes, and expect to receive the *fifth* shortly, commenced its career in the month of January, 1830, and is still continuing its course with undiminished power and energy—pleading the same cause as the Christian Baptist had previously done, and essentially advancing the Redeemer's kingdom throughout the American continent. The "Harbinger" is upon a considerably larger scale than the former journal—better printed and on better paper—the monthly numbers for each year form an octavo volume of between six and seven hundred pages, and is, in all respects, a truly respectable publication. The essays which I shall be enabled to extract from this masterly production, and lay before my christian brethren and friends on this side the Atlantic, through the medium of its *younger brother*, will, I confidently persuade myself, prove a source of much profitable instruction to them, as well as of edification and comfort. The remaining pages of the present number shall be occupied with a specimen of these masterly Essays."

On the cover of the April number, the Editor addresses his patrons in the following remarks:—

"In ushering the second number of the *Millennial Harbinger* into the world, the editor begs to congratulate his friends at a distance on the favorable reception which the undertaking has met with on its first appearance. The letters which he has received during the month, are sufficient to satisfy him that his plan is approved by many whose judgment he values, and that he has no need to despair of success. It was certainly very gratifying to him to find a whole column of the *Bath Guardian*, of March 21,—a newspaper of more than ordinary size, and, what is infinitely better, conducted with *far more* than ordinary talent, filled with an extract from Mr. Campbell's "Essay on the Christian Religion," (see No. 1. p. 31—41.) introduced by some exceedingly appropriate remarks, from the pen of an anonymous writer, who styles himself "A Lover of Good Men." The Editor is induced to mention this circumstance, chiefly for the purpose of inviting other friends in different parts of the country to imitate the example. They can be at no loss for interesting and pertinent passages to extract from Mr. Campbell's papers; and indeed, his letter in the present number, particularly that part of it which relates to the admission of our sable brethren to mingle with us at the Lord's table, —a practice rarely allowed in the United States, except among the churches in connexion with Mr. Campbell, affords excellent materials for that purpose. Scarcely any liberal journalist in the kingdom would refuse to insert an extract from that letter, if introduced by a

Digitized by Google

friendly hand. It is unnecessary to say, that, in doing this, the name of the publication, from which the extract is made, should be distinctly expressed; and, by that means, the attention of many would be drawn to the Millennial Harbinger. The wishes of the Editor have also, in part, been anticipated in this respect, by a kind friend in the *Scotsman* newspaper, published in Edinburg; a journal of first rate consequence, and of very extensive circulation. If the friends in Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Glasgow, &c., would adopt this plan, perseveringly, the best results must follow."

COPY OF A LETTER,

To the Rev. WILLIAM PHILLIPS, *Newport, Ky.*

JAMESTOWN, O. June 22, 1835.

Dear Sir,

IN the "Western Christian Advocate," of the 12th instant, I observe that you have resumed your pen *vs.* "Campbellism," as you call the doctrine of *faith, repentance,* and *baptism* for the remission of sins that are past.

You know that I have sought to reply to your numbers through the same paper that carried your strictures to the world, and that I furnished the Editor with regular replies to your numbers as they appeared. You also know that the Editor of the paper in which you write, refused to let its readers see my replies to you; and that in acknowledging the receipt of my letters, they were at one time quoted *uncurrent,* and at another time *vetoed.*

I have also addressed you by letter, proposing to join in the publication of a pamphlet, containing your numbers and my replies to them, for the purpose of sending them forth together, that the people might see both sides. This you declined, stating as a reason, that you might remove to a distant part of the state before your numbers were all published.

I now write to let you know that I shall have a copy of this communication published, that it may be known that you are apprized of the facts above stated: and that you have written, and still continue to write, knowing that no replies will be allowed to go to your readers through the paper in which you publish.

I shall now notice a few things said in your No. XI. In it you reiterate the old worn out charge, that we deny "the influence or operation of the Holy Spirit upon men" Because we do not go with you into metaphysical abstract operations, or influences, you say that we do not admit any influence at all.

Now, friend Phillips, answer the following question, and I will engage to place you between the horns of a dilemma, from which you cannot extricate yourself:—

Is the belief of an abstract, or direct operation of the Holy Spirit, necessary in order to said operation?

Digitized by Google

If you answer in the affirmative, then away goes your position; for that would make the operation through *faith*, and not *direct* or *abstract*.

This is the very thing for which we contend—"*that the Holy Spirit operates through the belief of God's Word.*"

If you answer in the negative, then why preach the necessity of believing it, seeing that the Spirit operates to the saving of men without the belief.

You have wasted, and are still wasting, much time in preaching and writing to men about that which will do them no good; for the belief or unbelief of the thing, does not alter the matter.

☞ Now get out from between these horns, if you can.

Respectfully yours,

M. WINANS.

FAITH ALONE.

JAMESTOWN, *Ohio*, June 25, 1835.

Beloved brother Campbell,

ALL the "faith alone" men, who build their arguments upon the reasoning of the Apostle Paul, when speaking of Abraham in his letters to the Romans, and to the Gallatians, have mistaken the argument of the Apostle, and the persons to whom he applies the terms "righteousness" and "justification," which terms the Apostle uses as synonymous in his reasoning; or else I have entirely mistook his arguments and application of the terms "righteous" and "justified."

I will now give my understanding of the Apostle, by way of a dialogue between him and a Jew.

Jew.—The Gentile disciples who have been made members of the church, cannot be justified of God, unless they be circumcised and keep the law of Moses, because God will not adjudge any righteous who violates his law, and the law is evidently of God.

Paul.—I admit that the law is of God; but God accounted Abraham righteous before he gave the law, and before Abraham was circumcised while he was yet a Gentile, Abraham was a man of faith and believed all that God said to him; on account of which God accounted him righteous; and he was justified in his sight. So now God accounts these Gentiles who have believed and obeyed him, righteous, and they stand justified in his sight—just as Abraham did—for neither Abraham nor they were ever under the law of Moses. He, then, that believes or trusts in God who justifies the ungodly, *his faith*, (not the faith of the ungodly, for it is not said they had any,) is counted for righteousness without law—just as Abraham's was—for they, as well as Abraham, are the servants of God, and are doing his will in all that he commands them.

Thus the terms "*righteous*" and "*justified*" are applied by the Apostle to the servants of the Most High God, and not in the sense of *pardon* as some suppose, for the expressions *righteous-ungodly*, or *ungodly-righteous*, would be to me paradoxical. Those who had their iniquities forgiven, and whose sins were covered, to whom God did not impute sin, *were the persons* to whom Paul applied the terms "righteousness" and "justification" in the sense that he applied them to Abraham, and not the ungodly as some suppose. The fact that God justifies the ungodly is simply stated by the Apostle; but he does not say one word about the means by or through which he does it. He says that Christ died for them in due season, or at the proper time; and that is all he says about it.

Digitized by Google

The Apostle's object was to settle the difficulty in the Church of Rome, between the disciples from among the Jews and the disciples from among the Gentiles, relative to circumcision and the keeping of the law of Moses. And to do it, he places the Gentile disciples upon a footing with Abraham, whom the Jews acknowledged to be the servant of God.

If this be the true understanding of the matter, then away goes the very foundation of "*the remission of sins by faith alone.*" For in all this argument the Apostle was speaking of such as had their sins covered, to whom God would not impute sin; and surely this will not apply to aliens, but only to the true Israel; and therefore does not mean the remission of sins, as some suppose.

M. WINANS.

Reformation---No. 7.

LIBERALITY.

THERE is nothing in which modern christians, even the best, are farther behind the ancient, than in the spirit and practice of *liberality:* not liberality of opinion; for in this the moderns far excel the ancients—but liberality of purse and scrip. The ancient Jews were the most liberal nation on earth—the modern Jews are the most selfish. Great faith has always been the parent of great liberality. Little faith makes a man poor in spirit; but great faith, like that of Abraham, makes a man large in spirit. Abraham, the Father of the Faithful, is as much distinguished in eternal fame for his liberality as for his faith. His donations to Melchisedeck became the measure and standard of all good Jews towards the ministers of religion among the elect nation. Independence of Mind and Liberality of Spirit are twin sisters—Faith and Love are their parents. The Father of all Believers is a model of the noblest independence of mind, of genuine hospitality, and of the most rational liberality.

Since the days of righteous Abel to the present time, true religion has always been an expensive and an expending thing. A cheap religion, and a religion that costs but little, is of no account in the reign of Heaven. Jesus Christ and all the martyrs gave life itself away: and the first converts gave up to Heaven, and for heaven, all they had on earth. Times and circumstances always have been not only the occasion, but the measure of christian liberality. Christians have always been an army of volunteers, who are ready at a moment to give up all at the beck of Heaven. Christians of old were industrious, frugal, economical—that they might be liberal. One of the precepts of our Apostle, still extant, is couched in the following words:—"Let him that stole, steal no more; but rather let him labor, working with his hands that which is good—that he may have to impart to him who has need." To labor for the purpose of having to distribute; to seek to be rich for the purpose of being rich in good works, is not the most ordinary virtue in this age. But such belongs to the calender of Heaven's virtues; and this, more than the purest orthodoxy, is a blessing to society.

Digitized by Google

If all the hours that are expended in strifes and debates about orthodox opinions, were devoted to business for the purpose of accumulating to bless the poor and to teach the ignorant, the christian communities would wear a quite different aspect in society. But this spirit has been quenched; and, instead of it, the selfishness of avarice, the pride of opinion, and furious zeal for orthodoxy, have converted the green fields of the plantations of grace into a dry and parched land, in which no waters flow. The sterility and barrenness of the church is the proper fruit of the commercial, trading, speculating, and peculating spirit of this age and country. Young men of ardent spirit, and of much devotion and useful talent, who might have turned many to righteousness, are induced to study law, physic, or trade, because of the neglects arising from the avarice and secular spirit of the church. The best talents in the country are thus alienated from the Lord, and made tributary to the world, the flesh, and Satan, often directly, and oftener indirectly, without the professor intending it or forming a due estimate of his course. Thus the Lord is robbed to help the world, under the pretext of honesty and good faith.

Men complain if the Lord demand from them more than the state; and they think they have done a great deal for the salvation of the world if they should give as much in twelve months for the furtherance of the gospel as they pay to government to protect their political rights: as if they owed more to Cesar than to God—to the reign of Jackson than to the reign of Christ. Until men can duly appreciate the things of Cesar and the things of God, the affairs of the forum, the barn, the cellar, the workshop, and the counting-room, and the affairs of the church—the cause of salvation must languish, and the cause of destruction must advance with fearful rapidity.

The spirit of the world, like a gangrene, is wasting away the strength of the church; and health and beauty cannot be restored to the body of Christ till the church adopts the regimen of Heaven and appreciates the balm of Gilead more than all the nostrums of religious quackery. But we now speak of liberality; and we regret to say that the disciples of the reformation do not generally excel in their contributions for the poor, the ignorant, and the perishing, the votaries of human creeds and the supporters of human inventions.

Because the avarice of a corrupt priesthood is worthy of reprobation, and the credulity of a priest-ridden and misguided liberality loudly calls for christian pity, some think that it is a virtue to keep all to themselves, and to make martyrs of the public servants of the Lord. There are, indeed, honorable and noble exceptions; but what is the honor of the few ought to be the boast of the majority. Every believer of the ancient gospel ought to be as eminent for liberality as for faith in God and zeal for his institutions. A great majority of the disciples in works of benevolence, charity, and in general liberality, are in no respect conspicuous above the devotees of human institutions. They are, indeed, equal in their zeal for themselves, and in endeavors to promote their own interests in all things temporal and worldly; but in the works of self-denial there is no very convincing

Digitized by Google

weight of argument on their side. This is not at all what it ought to be. Christians ought to be industrious, frugal, economical, in order to have more than they want for themselves that they may be rich in good works, liberal, and communicative to the necessities of saints and to the exigencies of society: "that they may lay up in store for themselves a good foundation for the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." It is much more blessed to give than to receive; and the soul of the liberal shall wax fat, and he that watereth others shall himself be watered again.

It is rather a rare occurrence to see a person laboring daily and assiduously for the sake of expending even a proportionate part of all the avails of his industry in the promotion of piety and humanity. However we may theorize about duty, privilege, and the use of means, and money as one of the chief means of doing good, one thing is becoming more and more obvious—that until christians, especially the rich and affluent, labor as devotedly for a constant revenue to expend under the guidance of the Messiah, and faithfully apply a just proportion of their incomes to the furtherance of the gospel, it will not run and be glorified as in the days of yore. EDITOR.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

QUERY.

IS it lawful for christians to intermarry with the world? Is it according to primitive usage, &c. A. H. A. *Indiana.*

ANSWER.

It was a necessary law in the Jewish nation, the family of Abraham, because of the promises concerning his seed, and because of the seductions to idolatry from intermarriages with the pagan nations, who all were idolators, that the seed of Abraham should not form such alliances with foreigners. The latter reason should have its full weight against christians intermarrying with idolators. And certainly, no one, rightly instructed in the christian institution, and possessing the spirit of the family of God, could become one flesh with an idolator. There is, indeed, no christian statute—no law commanding, nor statute prohibitory, on the subject of christians marrying only christians. A christian is not prohibited from marrying a Jew or a Gentile by any ordinance. But we must *infer* as well as *feel* the incongruity of a christian taking into his bosom an opponent of Christ, whether Jew or Gentile. He that would prefer an unbelieving Jew, Samaritan, Pagan, to a Christian, could not stand high in the estimation of any christian fraternity.

That the members of our churches, founded on the Book alone, should in no case marry a Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, &c. or the son or daughter of such persons, baptized or unbaptized, would be (*I think*) legislating out of the Record, and would be in a good measure *paganizing* all professors and non-professors out of the communities of our brethren. I am, however, from all that is written in

Digitized by Google

the good Book, strongly inclined, *inferentially I mean*, to the conclusion that christians should intermarry only with christians, especially when they look into all the consequences of the domestic relation, and anticipate the bearings that such a connexion always *may*, and often *must* have on the destinies of the offspring. But that a church should take an order, or decree that any person who marries a non-professor, (not a professed unbeliever or infidel,) or one from among the sects, shall forfeit his citizenship in the kingdom of heaven—is, in my judgment, a dangerous precedent, and wholly unwarranted by the living oracles of Jesus Christ. EDITOR.

THE CAMELION FISHER.

THIS little Proteus does some injury to the cause, especially when he pretends to be a disciple. We have not thought him always *compos mentis*. It is necessary that the public should be on their guard against such. There are several *irresponsible* preachers imposing on the community—some who have been found guilty of great misdemeanors by a jury of their peers. No person ought to be received without clear credentials.

Extract from a letter to J. R. M'Call, dated Woodville, Mi. May 13.

Matters and things are going on about as they were when you left, with one exception: "*A great revival*," as it is called, has taken place here since you left. About 60 persons have "*got religion*" under the *ministerial* labors of the far-famed and much renowned Mr. Maffitt and our brother Fisher. About Mr. Maffitt I have but little to say. You recollect Fisher asked you if you thought there was any chance to reinstate the "Old Baptists" in this country. The following is the plan he has pursued to accomplish his pretended object:—He has never preached in the Baptist church the first time. His first appointment was respectably attended; but he did not appear, and, to their great astonishment, he was at that time preaching in the Methodist church. He has preached with the Methodists and for them—called mourners to the altar—prayed for a Pentecostial shower of the *Holy Ghost* to come upon them—explained baptism away entirely—preaches that it has no meaning at all—that there is no essential difference whether the people be sprinkled, poured, or immersed—in a word, he preaches Methodism to the soul of it, if it has any. He says he pities the "Campbellites," and *reckons* he ought to pray for them—that they are awfully deluded, &c. He says the reformers do positively deny the Holy Spirit—that is, in Kentucky. I have tried for two weeks to get an interview with him; but he will not talk with me. Whenever I go to where he is, he takes his hat and finds an excuse that he had promised to be at such a brother's house at this time, &c. In short, he is doing us all the injury he possibly can, and talks of staying here this summer. He does not associate, nor even stay with the Baptists. Indeed he is a strange creature; but enough of him now.

B. L. D'SPAIN.

Departed this life on the 24th of June last, JOHN BROWN, Esq. of Wellsburg, Va. father of *Margaret Campbell*, dec'd. He was, indeed, a just and righteous man, and for the last 20 years of his life ardently devoted to the restoration of primitive christianity. He long cherished the hope of the resurrection of the just, in which hope he died ot the close of his 74th year.

COMMUNICATIONS ON HAND.

One from Elder T. M. Henley—J. R. H.—Reformed Clergyman—Questions on Ordination—☞Wait for the developements of my letters to Bishop Otey.—Letter from Dr. Du Val—from Spencer on Universalism—with many others. Also, Essays on Romanism, Education, and the Evidences of the Gospel—all on file. Most of them will appear in our next. The news and communications from England occasioned the delay of several of them till next month. We are always governed by our judgment of what the crisis demands, and the interest which the public take in certain matters.—ED.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number IX.——Volume VI.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. September, 1835.

Romanism---No. 2.

IN my first essay the first assumption of Romanism, viz.—"that Peter was the primate, or head of all the Apostles," was shown to be a falsehood—an assumption destitute of any countenance from any oracle of reason or of inspiration. The second assumption—"*That Jesus Christ founded his church upon Peter, whom he called the Rock,*" is equally false and absurd.

1. Jesus Christ never said he would build his church upon Peter; but affirmed that he would build it upon something distinct from Peter. His words are, (Matth. xi.) "Thou [Peter] art called Rock, (Cephas, a rock or stone;) and upon *this rock* I will build my church." Now, had Jesus said, I will build my church upon you, Peter; or, upon you, whose name is Rock; then, indeed, the Romanists would have had some excuse for their theory. But Jesus, by one of the most demonstrative terms in language, contradistinguishes Peter from the rock on which his church is built. His words are, "You are called Rock; and upon *this* Rock" [distinguished from you] I will build my church." The Greek original is still, if possible, more explicit—*Su ei Petros, kai epi tautee tee Petra:* literally, "Thou art Peter, and upon this the rock." *This*, demonstrative of something Peter had said, and contradistinguished from him, not only in construction, gender, and case, but by a pronoun alluding to what Peter had said—*Upon this—what you have declared.*

And what had Peter said concerning Christ? In answer to the question propounded, *Who am I, do you say?* Peter confessed, "*Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living God.*" Upon *this* confession, my church shall be built, was, in brief, the direct and positive reply of Jesus. Jesus Christ himself is the living corner stone. But a confession of faith in him, as such, is essential to any sinner's being built upon him as a living stone in this spiritual temple.

Digitized by Google

2. Paul asserts this distinctively, not only when he says that "man believes in his heart to righteousness, and confesses with his mouth to salvation;" but by an express avowal that the Messiah is himself the only foundation on which the church is built. 1 Cor. iii. 11. "For no person can lay any other foundation [on which to build the church] than that which I have laid, *which is Jesus the Christ.*"

3. And if we speak figuratively of all builders as founders, then all the Prophets and all the Apostles are equally the basement of the christian temple. For, in this sense, it is built upon the foundation of all the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself the chief corner stone. This also exposes the fallacy of the Roman assumption. James, John, or Thomas is as much the Rock on which the church is built, as Peter.

A due attention to the Saviour's style as a teacher, would have made the Catholic error impossible. The figurative use of the word *rock*, in connexion with Peter's name, is the occasion of this false position. A simple error it can scarcely be. Jesus' manner was to consecrate, on every suitable occasion, some object or incident around him as the vehicle of his views and wishes to his audience. He thus laid every thing under tribute to his mission. The fisherman and his net—the husbandman and his field—the shepherd, his flock, and fold—the vine—the harvest—the well of water—the bread, the leaven, &c. &c. The presence of an object, or the name of it, affords him metaphor, illustration, or argument, as the case required. On the shore of the lake of Galilee, he says, "Follow me, and I will make you *fishers of men.*" In the sheep market in Jerusalem, or when the sheep were following their leaders to the hill of sacrifice, he says, "I am the good *shepherd* and give my life for the *sheep*," &c. On the Mount of Olives, he says, "I am the *true vine*, and my Father is the *vine-dresser.*" In the corn fields, he says, "The *harvest* is ripe: pray the Lord of the *harvest* to send out *reapers* into his *harvest.*" By the well of Samaria, he says, "Would you ask of me, I would give you *living water.*" The "disciples forgot to take bread" into the boat when crossing the lake, and when murmuring among themselves about it; he says, "Beware of the *leaven* of the Pharisees." And here, when Peter made the good confession, his name indicating *stone* or *rock*, Jesus said, 'Upon this *rock* I will build my church.' As when the Jews spoke of the manna, he said, "I am the *bread of life;*" or when standing before the Temple, he said, "Destroy *this temple* and I will *build it* again in three days." A hundred instances might be adduced to show that the Saviour's manner of teaching, rescues this passage from the rude assaults of Peter's pretended successors. There is not, then, in all the canonical books a shadow, not even a pretence for the ridiculous assumption that the church of Christ is founded upon the person of Peter. A tottering and mortal foundation, indeed, it would have been for the New Jerusalem, the Temple of God's Spirit!!

The third pillar of Romanism is as weak and sandy as the two former. It is this: *That Peter founded the first church in Rome, and was the first Bishop of that church.* This is a question of historic

Digitized by Google

fact, and as such must be examined. The proof of this affirmation will not, cannot establish the claims of the Romanists: for should it be fully and satisfactorily proved that Peter founded and presided over the church in Rome, it logically avails nothing to the pretended supremacy of this Apostle, or of the church over which he presided; but if it cannot be proved, it is fatal to the pretensions of the Romanists; for then the source of all their pretended authority as the successors of Peter is dried up. Their fountain being dried up, the stream is, of course, without one drop of the waters of Siloam. The fountain and the stream are alike empty and dry.

Well, now, what the evidence that Peter founded and presided over the church of Rome? Is there in all the canonical Scriptures any evidence that Peter ever visited Rome at all! I must say, I know not where it is to be found. That Paul visited Rome at a late period of his life, is not to be questioned; for it is positively asserted. But from all that is written concerning Paul's visit to Rome, it is not to be inferred that Bishop Peter was then in the chair of that church; else he was very uncourteous to his beloved brother Paul, and Paul was very disrespectful of his Lord Bishop, both in his letter to the Romans, and during his sojourn in the city, according to Luke's account of the matter. When brought before Nero, (two years at least before Peter died,) Paul says, "At my first answer, no one stood by me, but all men forsook me. I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge."

Were Peter present with us, on the Romanist hypothesis, we would ask him to explain this his gross neglect of his "beloved brother Paul," when a prisoner in his diocess; nay, when a prisoner within the metropolitan church, and within a short distance of Peter's chair. But, perhaps, conjecture would say, this neglect of Pope Peter to his beloved brother Paul, explains why Paul never saluted Peter, nor went to see him while in Rome, A. D. 64. Upon the whole, the Romanists have so far implicated the good name of both Peter and Paul, that none of Peter's pretended successors can ever vindicate Peter from the charge of cowardly neglect as Bishop of Rome, nor Paul from insolent resentment and uncourteous demeanor towards his Lord the Pope of Rome, in refusing to name him in any of his epistles, except on one occasion, and that no way honorable to the infallibility of the Vicar of Christ.

But although all authentic antiquity is silent on the residence of Peter in Rome as President of that church, it is probable, and no more than probable, that he may have had the honor of wearing a chain in Rome, as Paul did. Lactantius says Peter came to Rome in the time of Nero, in which opinion Pagi agrees with him; but in what time of Nero's reign no witness affirms. Lardner and other laborious critics conclude, from a full examination of all ancient documents, that Peter could not have visited Rome prior to the year 63 or 64, shortly before his martyrdom, from which place he supposes him to have written his two epistles. Nicephorus, who lived in the ninth century, computes the sojourn of Peter in Rome at two years, and therefore gives him only the episcopate of two years. This,

Digitized by Google

however, is purely conjecture; for having examined Eusebius and other fragments of high antiquity, we must assert that there is no evidence that Peter lived one year in Rome, or ever presided one hour as Bishop of Rome. But it may be shown from the Acts of the Apostles and from the Epistles, that Peter could not possibly have been the first Bishop of Rome. The first converts of the Roman church were made in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost: "Roman strangers, Jews and proselytes," were among the first converts. Thus the church of Rome was not planted by the labors of either Paul or Peter in Rome. The church in Rome, A. D. 56, about the time of Paul's letter to the Roman christians, was already famous throughout the empire on account of its faith. Paul nor Peter never had yet been there; and if ever Peter had been Bishop of Rome after the date of Paul's letter, he could not be regarded as the first Bishop of Rome. His predecessors break the connexion between Peter and him whose Vicar he is said to have been.

It is evident from the Scriptures that Peter had not the presidency of any church out of Judea till after the council in Jerusalem, A. D. 50. From prison in Jerusalem he retired to Cesarea, and there abode A. D. 45. He next appears in Jerusalem at the conference, and about the year 51 or 52 Paul met him at Antioch, and gave him a reproof for his too great pliancy with the prejudices of his brethren.

There are two things which the Romanists cannot do; and these undone, their succession, and all that is claimed for it, is as airy and baseless as a dream. They cannot prove from Scripture, nor from any credible historian, that Peter was first Bishop of Rome; and, in the second place, they cannot prove that he was second, third, or fourth Bishop of Rome, or that he ever presided over the christians in Rome at all. Though the proof lies upon them who affirm, we may very easily, from the facts in the New Testament, show the contrary—I was going to say, prove the negative of their position. But we do not believe in works of *supererogation*, and shall dismiss the third pillar of Popery as a figment alike unfounded in the Bible, and in ancient history, ecclesiastic or political.

EDITOR.

Temperance Associations.

WE have always and uniformly borne our testimony in favor of temperance, righteousness, benevolence, and the co-operation of all christians and christian churches in the grand enterprize of converting the world; but at the same time we have borne our testimony against Temperance Associations, Missionary Societies, and every other human institution opposed to the honor, dignity, and usefulness of the Christian Institution. Neither has our observation of all the passing incidents in the history of these rival churches of human contrivance, during the last twenty years, diminished our respect for the church of Jesus Christ, nor our disrespect for the churches of men.

Digitized by Google

Our regard for the former has always increased in the ratio of our disregard for the latter.

Indeed, when we contemplate the manner of spirit of the members of these human churches, the tendencies of their operations, and the alliances which they form with the world, the flesh, and Satan, we cannot regard their triumph in any other light than as the disgrace of Jesus Christ, and the humiliation of his church. There is not an infidel in America (sots only excepted) who would not, could the Temperance Society banish one vice from the land, sound the triumph of human wisdom over the Christian Institution. They would boast that a human institution had done for the world what christianity had not done--what the gospel could not do.

The very plea of the infidel members of Temperance Societies for the enlargement of their church, is, that the church of Jesus Christ has failed to make its members temperate, and to reform the world. But few christians see or feel the consequences of their becoming members of temperance churches. They feel not that they disgrace themselves as christians when they unite with infidels and broken down drunkards, and bind themselves by their sanction to be temperate, or to abstain from wine and fermented liquors, confessing by their acts that they hold their relations to the church as too fragile, and the sanctions of the gospel as too weak to restrain them from the abuse of God's bounties.

But the infidel tendencies of the temperance church are now arresting the attention of some of the more pensive and considerate of the clergy of the Episcopal and Presbyterian church, especially since the motion has been made to abolish the Lord's Supper because of the wine essential to its observanco. Will our readers peruse, with attention, the following extracts from *Bicknell's Reporter*, of the 21st July:—

We are decidedly friendly to Temperance Societies—believe that they have accomplished much good—have arrested the downward progress of many a victim—and we desire to see a cause so fully identified with the moral welfare and happiness of mankind, continue to *deserve* the support of all philanthropists—of every true christian in the land. But as there are zealots, bigots, and hypocrites in every good cause, it is not surprising that the Temperance Reform is also cursed with a few ultra spirits, who, while they advocate Temperance, do so in a manner so intemperate and irreligious, that we fear that unless they are checked in their unholy warfare upon the institutions of the church, they will provoke a condition of things which every correct moralist will deplore. We allude to the efforts now being made by some of the friends of Temperance to abolish the use of wine at the Lord's Supper!—The topic is a serious one, and is beginning to excite attention. Already have such men as Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, and Dr. Sprague, of Albany, the one an Episcopalian, the other a Presbyterian, and both eminent for piety and distinguished for talent, stepped forward in denunciations of this new

Digitized by Google

and unholy reform. The former has just published a work on the Protestant Church, in the course of which he holds the following language:—

'I have now considered, my brethren, all the points involved in this interesting and exciting subject; and trust that I have shown sufficient *reason* to justify the prevailing sentiment of Episcopalians, in declining to be connected with the Temperance Reform. It is not because we do not love temperance; it is not because we do not loath and detest the disgusting and abominable vice of drunkenness; neither is it because we have any objections to the operations of the Temperance Society, if it were considered a mere worldly contrivance for the benefit of those who will not submit to the yoke of the Gospel. As a political, or a medical, or a dietic, or a social, or a commercial improvement, we have not one word to say against it; but shall rejoice, as much as others, to hear of any temporal good which it can perform. But we protest against it, in a religious aspect altogether. We protest against improvements made upon the Gospel or the Church in the nineteenth century of the Christian era. We protest against the claims of new inventions in Christian morals, and equally against that morality, which the infidel sets up by itself, without any reference to Christ, or any acknowledgment of his divine authority. In a word, we adhere to this, as in every other point, to the Scriptures, and to the Church which the Apostles planted. To the celestial standard here laid down for us, God forbid that we should presumptuously add any thing. From that only perfect system, God forbid that we should dare to take any thing away. If, in the natural body of the Lord's creating, the removing a single limb mutilates, and the adding a superfluous one deforms—O how careful should Christians be of that body of Christ, the Church, that it be preserved in the beautiful symmetry which the Saviour impressed upon it, without being marred by the destruction of its original members on the one hand, or disfigured by human additions on the other.'

The other, Dr. Sprague, recently delivered a sermon at Albany, which has since been published, in which he denounces in the strongest terms, the ultra and fanatic spirit of the advocates of Temperance, and especially the conduct of some of them with regard to the use of wine at the Communion Table. We annex an extract from this portion of the address.—

'In the next place, there are in many of our churches, individuals, who suffer the cup to pass them in the communion service, on the ground that they believe the use of wine, even on that occasion, to be sinful. And then there are periodicals, extensively circulated, lending their influence, in a greater or less degree, to their unhallowed innovation; and one religious newspaper especially, which has never to my knowledge, been ranked among ultra publications, is giving forth a series of articles from the pen of an aged and highly respectable clergyman, designed to show that the exclusion of all that can intoxicate from the holy communion is essential to the triumph of the Temperance cause. And the writer of these articles is understood

Digitized by Google

to be the author of a premium tract about to be published, in which he endeavors to establish the same position, and which is soon to be scattered through our churches, and for aught I know to be sent to the dwelling of every one of you. And there are other great names too, which stand pledged before the community to the same doctrine; and are doing all that industry, and zeal, and talents, and learning can do, to maintain and extend it. A distinguished professor of biblical literature in one of our theological seminaries—a man whose name is known scarcely less abroad than at home, and is justly regarded as reflecting a lustre upon the character of his country—has told us in an Essay which has just appeared, that, though he thinks wine *may* be used in the communion in such a way as to avoid reproach, and he is not himself disposed entirely to abandon it, yet it is by no means necessary to the acceptable celebration of the ordinance; and it is to be classed among the unessential accidents of the service, such as receiving the elements in a reclining posture, holding the service in an upper room, and other similar things, in which few churches now think of imitating the Apostles. Another professor, connected with one of our colleges, and a man whose talents, and acquisitions, and virtues no one holds in higher estimation than myself, has written an essay for publication, in which he endeavors to show that neither bread nor wine is essential to the acceptable observance of the Lord's supper; and that the Temperance cause cannot advance much farther until the use of wine is abolished from this ordinance. And in addition to these particular facts, there is another of a more general nature, which awakens my apprehension not less than those which I have already stated—I refer to the gradual and silent change that is evinced by the manner in which this subject is treated in the ordinary intercourse of life. Men who, a year ago, felt nothing but shuddering, when it was introduced, have come now to speak of it with timid caution, as if they were speaking of an unsettled question, upon which it were wise not fully to commit themselves; while some of them actually half adopt the principle, and others show that scarcely any of their former scruples now remain. And wherefore is this change? It is because the subject has gradually become familiar to them; and while the current in favor of this innovation has been imperceptibly becoming stronger, no effort has been made to resist it; and even ministers of the gospel have been silent, because they have apprehended no serious danger, or possibly because they have feared to sound the alarm, lest it should subject them to the charge of being hostile to one of the best of causes, and hence these individuals, by a process which they themselves can hardly analyze, and for reasons of which they can give little account, have been brought to their present posture of indecision at least, if not actually favoring the views, which, not long ago, they regarded with horror.'

Let no man of any sense, after perusing the above, ask how christian immersion could be changed into sprinkling, or partially abolished in the dark ages, or *spiritualized* away by the Quakers of the 17th

Digitized by Google

century; when now, in the 19th of the christian era, grave Divines and Professors in our Colleges are pleading a dispensation for the cup in the Lord's Supper, or a substitution of milk or water for wine. Logic and rhetoric would assail in vain the man, who, after a deliberate examination of these extracts, is not convinced that the temperance church is practically infidel and antichristian in its tendencies and results.

I need not add, that we have always represented the christian church as necessarily a temperance, missionary, and education society, and that its members are severally and collectively bound to do all in their power in behalf of religion and morality, at home and abroad, and farther than this they have nothing that they can do.

Editor Mill. Harb.

Reply to a Reformed Clergyman---No. 4.

BY S. M. M'CORKLE, A LAYMAN.

THE Reformed Clergyman says, "Literalists contend that the phrase '*coming of the Lord*' always means a personal appearance of the Lord, and nothing else." As there is a second coming predicted, most places where the phrase "*coming of the Lord*" is used, it has, no doubt, a reference to that event; but, most assuredly, in all places where there is a *coming in the clouds of heaven* spoken of, it always must have the same object in view, and nothing else.

In the Old Testament, the "*coming of the Lord*," "*day of the Lord*," "*great and terrible day of the Lord*," &c. have mostly reference to some special object, unequivocally expressed and understood; as the first destruction of Jerusalem, the fall of Babylon, the overthrow of Tyrus, and the like. Some few predictions in the Old Testament, to which an object is not plainly affixed, are yet to be accomplished in "the great and terrible day of the Lord" in the future.

A second dispersion of the Jews is plainly intimated by the old prophets; but no where are the circumstances of the dreadful event foretold. This was reserved to be uttered by him who spoke as man never spoke. One memorable prediction did he leave as a proof of his prescience—a prediction minutely made, and as remarkably fulfilled. I cannot believe that a single passage in the old prophets, after the days of Moses, alludes to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

I will now notice wherein our friend, like other commentators, has misapplied Old Testament predictions. As I am considered a literalist, let the reader know that I firmly believe there are many, very many passages in holy writ which must be considered figures; but always have a literal accomplishment or object. God's moral government on earth—*to wit*, the church, where it deserves the name of a church, is called *heaven*. This must be admitted, or destroy the meaning of sacred writ. The clergy are commonly literalists when

Digitized by Google

they should be figurative, and figurative when they should be literal. God, in order to make his two kingdoms harmonize, the moral with the natural, calls for sun, moon, and stars in his moral kingdom—calls it *heaven*. This heaven in times of great alarm or distress is represented as being eclipsed—in a state of obscuration or trembling. This justly represents the state of the Jewish church at the siege of Babylon; (see Isaiah xiii.) And what is meant by the shaking of the heavens, but the alarm the Jews must have had on the occasion? Is the moving the earth out of its place significant, or is it a mere rhetorical flourish, without an object in the whole transaction? No doubt the simple meaning of the passage is this: that the church, or God's moral government, trembled at the event; and the *earth*, the Babylonish government, in contrast with the moral, was moved out of its place. This is the true import of the figure, or they are to all intents and purposes unmeaning expressions. The words *heaven* and *earth* were used in the Jewish as well as the Christian dispensation, relative to God's moral government, and the kingdom of darkness, thus contrasted; and almost universally throughout the sacred pages they are used as figures, representing the kingdom of *light* and the kingdom of *darkness*; and when coupled together they will universally admit of this construction, and no other uniform consistent application of the figures can be made; and they are manifestly figures wherever used.

Our friend applies Joel, 2d chapter, thus:—"In the same chapter we have another *day of the Lord*, referring to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, verses 28, 32. This is quoted and applied by Peter, in part, in his Pentecostian address." Peter or my friend has made a wrong application of the prophecy: the one applies it to the destruction of Jerusalem—the other, to the introduction of the christian religion. (See Acts ii.) Yet with much propriety the 31st verse may be applied to a dissolution of the Jewish system of salvation, their city, and temple. The facts correspond with the figure: the moral heaven was dissolved, its light obscured "before *the great and terrible day of the Lord*."

Now, brother, if the Jewish system of worship, with all its appendages, was dissolved in the accomplishment of the figure found in Joel ii. 31. what is to take place under a like figure, only more terrible, found in the Apocalypse, which was written long after the destruction of Jerusalem, according to your own showing? Setting aside the dissolution of the Jewish dispensation in the first figure, and the close of the present Gentile administration in the second, (see Rev. vi. 12. and to the end of the chapter,) I defy all the commentators on earth to dispose of the figures without running into absurdities too palpable to be palmed on common sense.

But, according to our friend, the destruction of Jerusalem "is more graphically exhibited" in Zachariah xiv. I would sooner venture an opinion that this 14th of Zachariah in its accomplishment is wholly in the future, than on any one chapter in the Old Testament. And if our friend can make out this chapter applicable to the destruction of

Digitized by Google

Jerusalem by the Romans, I would not despair of his proving that the great battle of Armageddon also took place at the same time.

According to the Prophet, "half the city shall go forth into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city." Now this was not the fact when the Romans destroyed the city. And the Lord's feet is to "stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof, toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half toward the south." And from this cleft in the mount the people are to flee as they did "before the earthruake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah." The same kind of shock is alluded to. The event relative to the Mount is compared to, contrasted with, a literal earthquake which had taken place "in the days of Uzziah," without any "lines of circumvallation" in the case. And of all remarkable predictions, remarkably fulfilled, this deserves the palm—that this Mount of Olives, "by the lines of circumvallation, the redoubts and trenches made by the besieging army was cleft in twain." According to the Prophet, a great valley is to be the consequence of this cleft in the Mount, which by our expositor is turned into a ditch! And our friend will have to translocate the Mount to the north or the south of Jerusalem, before he can make the entrenchments made by the Romans, by the which Jerusalem was surrounded, suit the courses of the Prophet. And this coming of the Lord is to be attended with "all the saints." "And in that day living waters shall go out from Jerusalem, half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea; in summer and in winter shall it be." "And in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one. All the land shall be turned to a plain from Geba to Rimmon," &c. "and from the tower of Hananeel unto the king's wine press; and men shall dwell in it, and there shall be no more utter destruction; but Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited." This is scarcely a tithe of the prominent features of this 14th of Zachariah, parts of which our friend applies to the destruction of Jerusalem!!

A prediction in Malachi is as badly misapplied as the above. "Need we observe," says our friend, "that the day of the Lord mentioned by Malachi, is ascertained to be the day of vengeance upon the second temple and Jerusalem by the Romans." Brother, how have you ascertained this fact? Since the first act of disobedience on earth, down to the present day, has there ever been that time when "all the proud and all that do wickedly" were destroyed? Forsooth, it once happened, and there were but eight souls left. Was the *proud* and all that do *wickedly* left with neither "root nor branch" at the destruction of Jerusalem? The prophecy of Malachi must be, in its general bearing, in the future. We will now notice some of our friend's New Testament quotations relative to "the day of the Lord," "coming of the Lord," &c.

After the memorable prophecy on the Mount, the Apostles were silent on the subject relative to the destruction of Jerusalem; scarcely

Digitized by Google

the most distant allusion to the prophecy, or the impending fate of the nation. A different practice would have been imprudent and unwise. In most places where the coming of the Lord is mentioned in the New Testament, it is considered a matter of joy, rejoicing, of triumph—a *desideratum*, as the learned would say. Now, brother, apply this to the destruction of Jerusalem. Was it a matter of joy? Was the cause of Christ advanced by that dreadful event? Did the prosperity of the church depend on the downfall of the nation? Was there rejoicings called for on the occasion, as there is over the fall of Babylon? Think you that James was only admonishing christians to exercise patience for a little season when he says, "Be patient, therefore, unto the coming of the Lord"—to wit, *unto the destruction of Jerusalem*, according to our friend's theory!! See Mill. Harb. vol. 5, p. 584.

Now, sir, "that this was a day nigh at hand the Apostle clearly intimates—a day which the Thessalonians were expecting to see"—we will examine. In Paul's first epistle to the Thessalonians he had spoken of a "day of the Lord" which was to "come as a thief in the night." This had caused some uneasiness among the brethren. And in his second epistle he says to those "who are troubled, rest with us," &c. "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." Need I tell the brother that this son of perdition rose at least five hundred years after this prediction was made? and since that time not one solitary event has transpired to which we may apply the emphatical words, "*day of the Lord.*" Need I tell the brother the consequence if Inspiration had fixed on a certain day, and have said, 'In the year 1847 this coming shall take place'? No: Infinite Wisdom says, "Behold I come quickly"—"come as a thief." "For in such an hour as you think not, the Son of Man cometh." This is to keep men on the look-out, and in order to prevent them from saying, "Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." The Apostle introduces this important clause into his argument; "Beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day with the Lord is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."

I know of no passage in the New Testament where the words "*day of the Lord*," "*coming of the Lord*," &c. are used, which can consistently be applied to the destruction of Jerusalem. Commentators have made some rude blunders about the coming of Christ. I think they have made three comings beside his first advent—two invisible, and one at the close of time. The first invisible coming was at the destruction of Jerusalem—the other to be a spiritual presence during the Millennium—invisible. How is it to be proved? The coming at the destruction of Jerusalem is based upon a prediction

Digitized by Google

made by the Master—"This generation shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled." Mistaking the meaning of Christ, they have made a coming where there is none intended. This passage was most certainly relative to the Jews as a nation—not to their living inhabitants or generation at all.

There are three comings of Christ spoken of in the New Testament; two of them fulfilled, literally fulfilled by his personal presence. May we not expect the other to be accomplished in like manner? The first is predicted Matthew xvi. 28. "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." This was literally fulfilled when Christ, after his resurrection, commissioned his disciples to preach remission of sins through faith in his name and obedience to the gospel. Need I say to the reader of the New Testament, that the new dispensation was called *"the kingdom of heaven," "the reign of heaven"*?

Another coming is foretold, John xxi. 23. "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" This was spoken relative to John the Apostle, who did "tarry" till this very coming. An interview with John and the Master in the Isle of Patmos was a complete accomplishment of the passage. It had been foretold of Peter "by what death he should glorify God." Peter wishing to know John's fortune, says, "What will this man do?" The Master replied, "If I wish him to stay till I come, what is that to thee?" So the comings of Christ have all been overlooked or mistaken by *the learned*, so called—those who have been arrogating to themselves the key of knowledge.

Christ appeared to John in Patmos as truly as ever he appeared on earth, before or since his passion. And the design of this coming is plain: he says to John, "Write the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter." Had our commentators attended more closely to the simple and plain meaning of God's word, the world at this time would not have been so filled with their figurative meanings of figures, their absurdities, and conjectural nonsense about "Spanish armadas," "French revolutions," "Goths and Vandals," "great heathen lights," "gods and goddesses, demi-gods, and deified heroes," as being the meaning of God's *revelation!*

To Dr. James Otey, Bishop of Tennessee.

Letter V.

MY DEAR SIR,

FOR two good reasons we argued in our last that the office of Apostles has ceased: First, because it is impossible that persons born after the death and resurrection of Jesus could be witnesses of his sayings, doings, death, and resurrection; and that this was one half of the apostolic office has been proved, and assented to on all sides.

Digitized by Google

Next, because the christian revelation is complete, and the christian institution is reared by the Apostles, which was the other part of their office. It is inexpedient to muster a hundred reasons, when two impossibilities render both office and succession inconceivable. It is impossible that any man living can exercise the office of Apostles in either half of the office which Jesus assigned them.

But that there is an order of Apostles distinct from those commissioned by Jesus, possessing general superintendance, a right to ordain, and the exercise of discipline, destitute of all the qualifications of Christ's Apostles—as eye and ear witnesses of the word—destitute of all the gifts of the Spirit necessary to revelation and the erection of the christian church—a sort of sub-Apostles, such as Timothy and Titus, is all that Episcopalians contend for.

Touching this class of inferior Apostles, one thing must be conceded, and that involves their pretensions in extreme jeopardy. It is this—*that their commission is not found written in the canonical Scriptures.* In what chapter and verse may we expect to find their commission from Jesus! Or, that being impossible, in what chapter and verse may we find their commission from the Apostles? Bishop Onderdonk would say, 'In the Epistles of Paul to Timothy and to Titus; for these two Bishops were commissioned by Paul.' Grant it, and what then? They were Apostles of Apostles—not co-ordinates, but subordinates—agents *pro tempore*, not for life—without a diocess, and without a permanent charge. Their commission was, in fact, no more than this: 'I *entreat* you, my son Timothy, to remain at Ephesus where I left you—to superintend the affairs of that church—to instruct its teachers—to exercise discipline, and to exhort and teach the congregation, till I call you hence.'

'Titus, I left you in Crete that you might set in order the things left unfinished, and ordain seniors in every city, as I *commanded* you. I now enjoin you to rebuke the Cretans—to inculcate the things which become wholesome doctrine—to exhort and reprove with all authority—to teach and exercise discipline faithfully while you continue in Crete; but when I shall send Artemas to you, or Tychicus, leave Crete and hasten to me at Nicapolis; for I want your services there during the winter.'

From these commissions it clearly appears that Timothy was not ordained Bishop of Ephesus, nor Titus of Crete, as the apocryphal postscripts found in our common Testaments falsely assert. Timothy is regarded in the Acts of the Apostles as one of Paul's ministers, (Acts xix. 20. xxi. 4.) and as such it was necessary that he should act for Paul and under his instructions.

The following facts are of importance in deciding the question concerning the diocess and jurisdiction of Timothy:—

1. He was not in Ephesus when Paul addressed the Elders or Bishops of Ephesus at Miletus. Acts xx.

2. The address itself proves that the Bishops of Ephesus (for in the original they are called *Bishops*) were under no Diocesan or Arch-

Digitized by Google

bishop, and that the church in Ephesus was constituted by the Apostle without any such superintendency.

3. Timothy was only left in Ephesus while Paul went over into Macedonia, and the first letter to Timothy shows that Paul wrote to him only to continue there for a time. Hence Timothy was never permanently located in any capacity at Ephesus. *"Till I come"* was the tenure of his ministry at that city; but *"if I tarry long,"* says Paul, I instruct you how, during my absence, you should behave in that church. All these directions had reference to some special circumstances in Ephesus peculiar to it at that time.

4. It is evident that Timothy did not long continue in Ephesus; for he was with Paul in Rome, and is joined with him in his Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, written during his first imprisonment. From all that appears in the Acts and the Epistles, Paul spent more time in Ephesus than ever did Timothy; for he was there first and last about three years, and it is not evident that Timothy was absent from Paul more than two years at most.

5. It is assumed that the second letter to Timothy was written to him while at Ephesus; but this is only an assumption—it ought to be proved. It cannot: for if Timothy were at Ephesus, then why should Paul have said to him in that letter, "I have sent Tychicus to Ephesus." Again, if Timothy had been at Ephesus, Paul would not have sent him to Troas for his books and parchments before his return to Rome. It is all assumption, and very improbable assumption. Now, let it be carefully noted that Timothy, not being at Ephesus when the second letter was written to him, there is no authority for the opinion that he ever was in Ephesus after Paul's first imprisonment, or that he ever after officiated in any capacity at Ephesus.

6. The Epistle to the Ephesians, written some two or three years after Paul had left Timothy at Ephesus, affords not the least countenance to the opinion that Timothy was there, or then Bishop of that church; for it has no allusion to him whatever.

Without a waste of words in expatiating on these facts before us, which, to you, would, indeed, be wholly superfluous, may we not say, that there is not the slightest scriptural evidence that Timothy was an Apostle of Jesus Christ, or that he was Bishop of the church in Ephesus, in the Episcopal acceptation of the word?

It is needless to spend time on the case of Titus. It is unequivocally evident that the unfinished business assigned him in Crete was by Paul expected to be soon accomplished, and therefore he was commanded to leave that place on the arrival of either Artemas or Tychicus. His was a temporary and not a permanent employment in Crete.

In the next place, it is abundantly clear that Titus was Paul's minister, and not Christ's Apostle; for in 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13. he intimates that he expected him to minister to him at Troas. In 2 Cor. vii. 6—13. we find him waiting upon Paul in Philippi. Again, we find him (2 Cor. xii. 18.) Paul's minister to Corinth in reference to the collections for the poor. And we find him (2 Tim. iv. 10.) on

Digitized by Google

business for Paul at Dalmatia. All of which is not very flattering to the claims of diocesan prelates. There is, then, no scriptural evidence that Titus lived or died Bishop of Crete.

The case of Timothy and that of Titus, together with the prelatical angels of the seven Asiatic churches, when candidly examined, I trust I need not now say to you, afford no flattering encouragement to those who contend for diocesan episcopacy as a New Testament institution.

That these ministers of Paul did preach the gospel, teach the christians, lay hands on elders elect, and exercise rule over the communities during their sojourn is, I think, undeniably evident. Those who have no system to defend or impugn, will, I presume, not only see, but cheerfully acknowledge this—at least I do.

That there is, however, an order of men in all ages their successors in office, whose sole right it is to do these things, is quite another proposition, and one which never has been (in my judgment) satisfactorily proved; and sure I am that the apostolic writings afford no instructions for the creation and perpetuation of such an order of men as distinct from, and superior to, the Bishops of a single congregation.

That every christian community ought to have its own bishops and deacons, and that it may have its own angels, messengers, or agents, call them almoners, preachers, or evangelists, or missionaries, (I am not fastidious about their designation,) I am as fully persuaded as I am that we are to have christian congregations and good order in them. That all officers are to be elected by the whole community, and formally set apart to the work assigned them, is a proposition of easy proof. Besides, the nature of society requires this as the only rational medium between despotism and anarchy, and experience proves that it is indispensable to the prosperity of the christian kingdom.

But the questions, *What is the peculiar grace of ordination*, and *Who has authority to lay on hands*, are matters deeply involved in the mists of the dark ages, and of no easy solution by either high or low churchmen. And Bishop Onderdonk says that "*lay ordination* and a *lay ministry* have but feeble claims, and will scarcely pretend to rest on either scriptural command or example." Apart from this, to the New Testament barbarous language, we must say, Then is the church, if any there be on earth, in a miserable plight; for on earth there is no other ministry than what he calls a *lay ministry*, when matters come to be traced to the bottom; at least, there lives not the man who can show clearly and satisfactorily that all the official grace and authority with which he is invested sprang not originally from the laity. And the very assumption that "sacraments" derive their virtue from the hands that administer them—and that these hands, in order to their valid exercise, must have been consecrated by something flowing down in human bodies through eighteen centuries from the persons of Apostles, nullifies every ordinance of Heaven and makes salvation impossible.

Digitized by Google

Be not startled, my good sir, at the unqualified boldness and the undisguised plainness with which I express my convictions on this subject. Let me, however, assure you that I go for order, good order—for bishops—for deacons—for missionaries, or preachers, if you please—and for their consecration by the laying on of hands, by prayer and by fasting; and then for their attendance upon their respective works, with all fidelity and authority. In order to a full development how this can be, something more is requisite than the disproval of the Episcopal plea for ordination by a superior order of clergy—an inquiry must be instituted into the peculiar grace of ordination; a subject, which, in my judgment, has not yet been fully disenthralled from the mysticism of the Papacy.

The doctrine of your own church, my dear sir, as is well known to you, is very far from being uniformly consistent on the grace of ordination. It has changed in theory or in practice, in England, with every new dynasty that has sat upon the British throne, from the Lutheran age till the accession of the House of Hanover. It will be as a shade in the picture, or as a foil to a jewel, to glance at the theory and practice of official grace, both among Romanists and Protestants, before we look into the Bible system. A few notices of this sort shall make up the burthen of my next epistle.

As ever, with all respect and esteem, &c.

EDITOR.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

The State and Conversion of the Sects.

"You search the Scriptures, because you think to obtain by them eternal life. Now these also are witnesses for me; yet you will not come to me that you may obtain life. I desire not honor from men; but I know you, that you are strangers to the love of God. I am come in my Father's name, and you do not receive me; if another come in his own name, you will receive him. How can you believe, while you court honor one from another, regardless of the honor which comes from God alone?"—John v. 39—44.

THUS did the Jews find themselves reproved by Messiah. The great mass of that people rejected utterly the whole testimony which it pleased God to adduce in behalf of the pretensions of Jesus of Nazareth, under the fatal operation and influence of human opinion and honor. They could easily have rid themselves of this baneful influence by turning to Jesus. But they had to let go the one before they could receive the other. Their choice, their course, and their curse have been sadly celebrated for about eighteen hundred years.

Many of our orthodox preachers quote the above scripture in application to the Gentile world, instead of the Jews. A moment's reflection ought to lead them to the correction of the error. But there

Digitized by Google

is a striking fitness in the application of the words of the Saviour to the great mass of *the sects* of the present day. It seems to me that they at least equal the Jews, if, indeed, they do not exceed them in their course of disobedience to Jesus Christ. For while the Jew clave to Moses, he clung to a *religion of God;* but the sects, each, makes, adopts, and practises its *own religion!* Taking part from the Bible—part from philosophy—part from tradition, and the balance from such worldly motives as may affect their present temporal interests. If this is not a fair statement, it is the result of ignorance of their course, both as to *faith and practice.* Let us, reader, look for a moment at the fitness of the Saviour's words in the application to the sects. He says, "You search the Scriptures." Who is it that diligently searches the Scriptures, (New, as well as Old?) Surely not the Gentile world. The answer, then, is, The *present christian* world. The Jews themselves, with the veil on their eyes, reject the new, and only search the Old Scriptures through the glasses of their leaders. I repeat it, then, that it is the *so-called christian world,* who searches the Scriptures, *New and Old.* It is this great class who plead for the Scriptures—their authenticity—beauty—sublimity—fitness—excellency and worth. But, alas for the world! their generous labor and profound research have been mainly directed to the end of producing *"faith alone."* But why do they search? "Because" they "think to obtain by them eternal life." Is not this the avowed object? And with multitudes of them, the real object? But it is still possible for even the most sincere to deceive themselves. The heart of man is exceedingly deceitful. "Yet you will not come to me that you may obtain life." Have the sects come to Christ? Have they bowed to his authority? Have they yielded him unqualified submission? Have they been all cast in the same form, or "model of doctrine," to which the ancient saints were given up? Do we find among them scripture *unity* and scripture likeness? Do we find the scripture love and the spirit of Christ, with their fruits? Are they all built upon "the Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief foundation corner stone"? Far from these things are the faith and doings of the present sectarian world. They surely have not submitted themselves to Christ. In no relation whatever do they render to him due allegiance. Instead of manifesting their fealty to him, and to his authority and government, as presented in the constitution and laws of the New Testament, as an *humble executive body,* they have almost uniformly usurped *legislative* authority, to the utter subversion of the divine government. It is an act of unqualified high treason in the body of Christ, to presume to enact one law of any kind in the kingdom of Jesus Christ. They who do so, reject Christ and his government as being unworthy of their regard. The sects have done so in numerous particulars. The simple worship of God, through Christ, by the Holy Spirit, according to the Scriptures, is now hardly known in the earth. But again, "I desire not honor from men; but I know you, that you are strangers to the love of God." Who is it that loves God! He who keeps his commandments. God's plan of redemption

Digitized by Google

goes a little farther than the possession of mere abstract principles. It is easy to have love, and to talk of love; but christianity insists that we shall *manifest love*. How? "If you love me, *keep my commandments*." Compare these with the commandments, disciplines, rules, and regulations of the different denominations; each of which is respectively distinguished by this very feature in its existence. If the Catholic denies the authority of the Pope, it is because he has ceased to keep his commandments; and he has ceased to keep his commandments, because he has ceased to love him. When a Methodist reforms, he is chargeable with a want of love to John Wesley, *et cetera*. Our Lord Jesus Christ, who has been honored by Prophets, by all holy men who have been taught to appreciate him—by angels—and by God himself, cannot, as he says, "desire honor from men," who are resolved only to honor him in their own way. Will-worship, or honor, he contemns. Lastly, "How can you believe while you court honor one from another, regardless of the honor which comes from God alone?" The want of faith in Jesus as the Messiah, distinguished the subjects of God's wrath among the Jewish people. A grand division, or split, was produced among the Jews by the testimony of the Holy Spirit at the mouths and hands of the Apostles. Faith, or the belief of this testimony, made *thousands* to be one, and of one mind, judgment, spirit, and practice; while *unbelief*, so to speak, left *hundreds of thousands* of one body, one mind, judgment, spirit, and practice. The one class esteemed above all other things the honor of God; while the other more highly estimated the honor of men.

Now, reader, is it not a lamentable truth, that the present sectarian world has but partially received, understood, believed, and obeyed the divine testimony and will? They believe many things, it is true, as laid down in the word of God; and precisely, in as far as they so believe, every one is like his neighbor. But an immense amount of disagreement exists, at the same time that we admit the existence of this partial unity. While, therefore, the whole amount of unity is ascribable solely to the existence of faith, we are constrained to charge the balance to its opposite, unbelief, or the want of faith; or, perhaps, more properly, to our honor one for another. The christian world has, since the great reformation of the sixteenth century, been more or less deeply engaged in cultivating a spirit of universal suavity, particularly among all those who seemed in adequate measure to abhor "the Mother of Harlots." Instead of going on, upon the true principles of reformation, which would have led them to Jesus Christ, with all the blissful consequences of union, purity, and peace, attention was diverted, and they missed the prize. And at this day we find some hundreds of these christian bodies, all most *charitably* honoring and receiving honor one of another, while they most evidently *disbelieve* many of the most important facts of the New Testament; receiving and believing instead, their own deductions and opinions, or the opinions and traditions vended to them by their respective teachers. Compliments are always more acceptable than the contrary; and not unfrequently the measure of satisfaction is

Digitized by Google

graduated by our corruption. It is possible for us to be so blinded by corruption, as to be reduced to swallow even flattery itself.—Paradoxical as it is, it is now no strange thing, for the Episcopalian to hail the Presbyterian as orthodox, as a good christian, which of course must be reciprocated with a like honor. The Methodist comes in with his missionary or other plan, and the Regular Baptist with his scheme; all together reciprocate all becoming civilities and cordialities. All numerous—all respectable—all wealthy—all exerting much popular influence upon the world—which influence now and then depends very much upon the amount of honor conferred upon each by the other, they accordingly act. Having assumed the christian *name* and *character*, they take upon themselves *the work* of christians. But introduce into one of those extraordinary convocations, Jesus Christ and the Apostles, with their plain terms of citizenship—plan of new relations—and consequent obligations;—the plan of forgiving sins, and the necessity of union and obedience to Jesus Christ, as King in Zion;—let these heaven-sent teachers rebuke them for their divisions, strife, traditions, philosophy, new names, strange practice, perverse disputings, rejection of his discipline and worship, by their dethronement of the divine ambassadors, and their consequent apostacy; and what will be their course? They become immediately offended, but not without pain; nor can they be relieved without the mollifying balm of human honor. Now, reader, do not such, with the exception of the Regular Baptist (who has been barely discipled) stand in need of conversion to Jesus Christ our Lord? And should not personal direct efforts be made, in the spirit of our holy Saviour, to convert the present sectarian world? I know that these are offensive questions; but they are fraught with momentous consequences. Every man's common sense must convince him, if he knows any thing of the New Testament, that the religion called christianity, is not the religion of Jesus Christ as described in that Book; nor the distracted body called Episcopalian, Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, &c. &c. are not one and the same; nor by any means to be considered like the body of ancient christians. These things being so, I ask again, do they not need conversion, and should not direct and persevering efforts be made to accomplish the design? While they are deeply engaged in converting the world to their systems of opinions, and mal-practices, let some competent, devoted son of God, arm himself with the panoply of heaven—take his life in his hand, and go forth in the strength of the God of truth and righteousness; in every house of these mistaken worshippers, let him, like the Apostles of old, go, from week to week, and speak forth the "words of truth and soberness." As the most self-righteous were the first to be, and the most highly offended at such a course in the Saviour and Apostles; so, in this day, those that occupy the high places, will be the first and most loud in the cry of alarm. As chains, prisons, confiscation of property, loss of reputation and friends, and loss of life, distinguished the first martyrs to truth; so, in a greater or lesser degree, will it be in these last days. Let not these things appal us. If God be with us, we need not fear.

Brethren of the reformation, what think you of the idea? The

Digitized by Google

people are turned by sectarian influence from those places where they might hear the truth: and all that remains, if we would do the most that can be done, is to go to the fountain of influence; stand before the priests and elders of the people and warn them faithfully. God rules in nature, in providence, and in grace. Obedience to the immutable laws of Heaven must ever terminate in the most harmonious and happy consequences. I cannot so far question the divine goodness and government, as to believe that God would abandon a devoted servant under such circumstances. The great facts before the reader are, that the sectarian world is now mainly in *unbelief*, and consequent *disobedience* to God; that we find chiefly the most antichristian and apostate divisions, instead of christian union, peace, and purity; that the consequences upon mankind are deplorable, turning the world from the truth; all which, as evils, we propose to remedy, by raising competent, pious, and devoted men, who shall strike at the root of all these deplorable evils, by attempting *the conversion of the sects themselves to the faith and practice inculcated in the New Testament.*

I feel fully persuaded, that if any number of millions of persons would receive the one testimony, that it would produce the "one faith;" that the "one faith" would lead to the "one immersion;" that submission to the "one immersion" would produce the "one body;" that the existence of the "one body" would entitle to the influence and presence of the "one Spirit;" that the presence of this Spirit would strengthen us in unity, and add the "bond of peace;" wherein, and by which, we might acceptably worship the "one God and Father of all, who is over all, and with all, and would be in all" christians: to whom be all glory, and power, and dominion, through Jesus Christ our Lord!

I have no doubt that many will consider the proposed scheme extravagantly chimerical. I trust that the beloved Editor of the Harbinger will invite such to speak freely. I conceive that the plan may be defended against both civil, political, moral, and religious objections. Should no other be inclined to examine the subject, I must request brother Campbell to give at least, an opinion upon it. The particular manner in which I would propose to accomplish the great design, if deemed necessary, shall be laid before the public.

Having hitherto presented my thoughts to the readers of the Harbinger, over a part only of my name, which I think a violation of propriety, I have determined to abandon the practice, and subscribe myself JOHN DU VAL.

King and Queen, Va. June 27, 1835.

Faith Alone.

JAMESTOWN, O. June 29, 1835.

Dear brother Campbell,

THE mistake of all the "faith alone," (as I suppose, for I think they are all mistaken, even the most learned among them,) has

Digitized by Google

been for the want of distinguishing between the different dispensations under which men have lived (a great source of error by the by) and for want of this distinction they have brought Abraham under the present, or gospel dispensation, in which there is actual remission of past sins. They forget what Paul has taught about dispensations, how that all are to be judged according to the dispensations under which they lived: the Gentile without law, other than that manifested in the visible creation—the Jew, by the law; and all under the gospel dispensation by the gospel. Hence the *books* spoken of in the plural number, which are to be opened, and out of which the human family are to be judged, every one according to his works. Besides, Paul speaks of sin from Adam to Moses; but says that sin was not imputed, or charged, where there was no law; and if not charged it could not be forgiven; for "where there is no law there is no transgression;" and where there is no transgression there can be no pardon. Therefore, before they can speak of Abraham's pardon they must show his transgression—and that, too, without law, if they can; which I think it will be hard to do. So that it is evident that the terms "*righteousness*" and "*justification*," when applied to Abraham, never did mean the forgiveness of sins.

Besides, Paul has expressly taught that "the blood of bulls and goats" never did take away sins. Therefore, *actual remission* belongs exclusively to the Kingdom of Heaven, which was set up in the reign of the Cesars by John the Baptist, and matured by Jesus and his Apostles.

But the great confusion now existing in the religious world is, in part, owing to the want of distinction between the different dispensations; and in fact this want of distinction is one of the great sources of scepticism.

The same result would manifest itself in regard to the visible creation, were men to lose sight of the difference between climates and soils, and begin to plant sugar, coffee, cotton, and rice in the wheat climate and soil; and, *vice versa*, to sow wheat, oats, and barley in the sugar, coffee, and cotton climate and soil. We should soon have men doubting the use or design of the earth, seeing that it would not produce from the seed planted.

Thus by transplanting the *laws* of one dispensation, or age, into another, men have confused God's revelations and rendered them contradictory, which has led to scepticism.

In fact, I have heard some ignorant men say that *baptism* was not necessary to salvation now, because Adam, Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, &c. were not baptized—not knowing, or forgetting, that baptism was not appointed of God as a religious institution until he sent his servant John to prepare the way of the Lord, by giving the people the knowledge of salvation by the remission of their sins. By this institution he was to purify the *bride* for the reception of the *bridegroom*; or, "make ready a people for the Lord."

As ever, yours, M. WINANS.

Digitized by Google

EVASIONS OF SCRIPTURE.

IT exhibits strong evidence of the defectiveness of a religious system and its want of agreement and harmony with the truths of the Bible, when its advocates are compelled to resort to *evasions* of the word of God in supporting and sustaining any of its tenets. Those who are untrammelled by a sectarian system, who are free from *party* biases, influences, and prejudices, and who advocate the cause of Christ instead of the cause of a *sect*, are not afraid, and never "*shun* to declare *all* the counsel of God."

These remarks are made as prefatory to a notice of some *evasions* of Scripture, which attracted the attention of the writer not long since, in support of the tenet in the "Methodist Discipline," page 11: "Wherefore, that we are justified by faith *only*, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." The first is contained in the "Western Methodist Preacher," for April, 1835, in a discourse on the "*Weightier Matters of the Law*," by "Rev." LEWIS GARRETT, one of the Editors of the "Western Methodist," and is as follows:—

"Faith will appear as a *weighty* matter when we reflect that it is the *condition* upon which our *salvation* is suspended: "He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not, shall be damned." p. 59.

Now how will this compare with Mark xvi. 16. as it is in the New Testament, and from which it seems as intended to be quoted? "He that believeth, *and is baptized*, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." Agreeably to the above *theory*, faith *alone*, a *principle* of the christian religion, is made the condition of salvation! A man saved by a mere *principle!* Who ever read of such a thing in the Bible?

But the most palpable and barefaced evasion which I have ever met with, is contained in the above periodical for May, 1835, in a sermon on "*Justification and its Fruits*," by "Rev." PHINEAS T. SCRUGGS. It is made in support of the same tenet quoted above, and is as follows:

"God, who is rich in mercy, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved; being moved by love and compassion, God devised the scheme of man's redemption by the sacrifice of his Son, whereby he can be just and the *justifier* of him that believeth, caused the divine *proclamation* to be *written*, and *heralds* to be sent out into all the world to instruct in meekness those that oppose themselves, and by the ministry of reconciliation committed to them, to proclaim, "He that *believeth* shall be *saved*, and he that believeth not shall be damned." Every man, therefore, who by *repentance* towards God and *faith* in our Lord Jesus Christ, shall *thus* submit to *the terms of pardon*, shall have his *sins forgiven* and enjoy peace with God." p. 74, 75.

"Faith *only*," it seems, will not do here, but *repentance* is found necessary to make out "the terms of pardon," which are, agreeably to the above, "He that believeth shall be saved," repentance not being mentioned there. A person has to "submit to the terms of pardon" by repentance *and* faith on the condition of faith *alone!* What a con-

Digitized by Google

sistent and admirable system! The plans of *man* are like himself—defective and wanting in wisdom. How well does the above quotation accord with Mark xvi. 16.! and the sentiment in the last part of the extract, with Acts ii. 38.! "Repent and *be baptized*, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*." Where, I would ask, can it be found in all the New Testament, that our Saviour caused "heralds to be sent out into all the world," and "by the ministry of reconciliation committed to them to proclaim" what they are represented above to have done? Where did the Lord ever give any such commission to the Apostles? Why should Mr. Scruggs leave out "*and be baptized;*" and not include the *act* as well as the *principle?* Mr. Garrett's and Mr. Scruggs' "*faith only*," by which they would have the sinner justified, saved, and pardoned, is a *dead* faith according to the Apostle James. He says, "Faith, if it hath not *works*, is *dead* being *alone;*" and, "By *works* a man is *justified*, and *not* by faith *only*." The person, then, who is "justified by faith *only*," is justified by a *dead* faith, and of course must be in possession of a *dead* justification!—"*a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort*"!!! J. R. H.

OAK GROVE, *near Paris, Tenn.* July 3, 1835.

Popery in America.

IT has been repeatedly asserted in the religious papers that large sums of money are annually contributed in Europe for the support of Catholic missionaries in this country; that there are societies established for the express purpose of building up Popery in the United States of America, and that these societies are not only patronized by the Pope, but by other despotic sovereigns, with the view, doubtless, of destroying the influence of our republic on the progress of liberal principles in the Old World. It has been asserted that large sums have been raised by these societies and remitted to Cincinnati for the support of missionaries in the Valley of the Mississippi. Many persons have been disposed to call in question the truth of these assertions; but we now have it in our power to support them by official documents. A gentleman who has recently returned from a tour in Europe, has put into our hands the annual reports of a missionary society established at Vienna, in 1829, under the name of "The Leopold Foundation for aiding Catholic Missions in America by contributions in the Austrian Empire." These reports contain the society's constitution and a regular history of its operations, embracing minute statements of the receipts and expenditures, and copious extracts from the letters of its missionaries in this country. We have room this week only for the constitution of the Society, and the Pope's letter of approbation.

From statements, the details of which we shall publish hereafter, it appears that the receipts of this society from the commencement of its

Digitized by Google

operations in July, 1819, to October 31, 1832, were 160,906 florins, or more than $74,000. Of this sum, 50,000 florins, (about $21,000,) were sent in three remittances, during the year 1830, to the late Bishop Fenwick of Cincinnati, for the support of popery in his diocese! a larger sum, we believe, than was expended in the same district, during the same period, by all our Protestant missionary societies taken together.—*Eds. N. Y. Observer.*

RULES FOR THE INSTITUTION

Erected under the name of the Leopold Foundation for aiding Catholic Missions in America, by Contributions in the Austrian Empire.

1. The objects of the institution under the name of the *Leopold Foundation*, are—1. To promote the greater activity of Catholic missions in America. 2. To edify Christians by enlisting them in the work of propagating the church of Jesus Christ in the remote parts of the earth. 3. To preserve in lasting remembrance her deceased majesty Leopoldina, Empress of Brazil, born Archduchess of Austria.

2. The means selected to attain these ends, are *prayer* and *alms*.

3. Every member of this religious institution engages daily to offer one Pater and Ave, with the addition, "*St. Leopold, pray for us!*" and every week to contribute a crucifix; and thus by this small sacrifice of prayer and alms to concur in the great work of promoting the true faith. As, however, every one is free to enroll himself in this society, he may also leave it at pleasure.

4. Every ten members shall appoint one of their number a collector, to receive the weekly alms. The collector shall see that the small number of his company, after the death or removal of any, is filled up. The alms collected shall be paid monthly, by the collector, to the parish minister of his district.

5. Every parish minister shall pay over, as opportunity offers, the alms collected in the manner prescribed, to the deacon, (in Hungary, the vice arch-deacon,) and he to his most reverend ordinariate.

6. If any one intends a greater sum for this pious end, and that to be paid at once, his alms may be given either to the parish minister, with his own inscription inserted in the rubric designed, or to the deacon, (or vice-deacon,) or immediately to the most reverend ordinariate.

7. The most illustrious and reverend lord bishops of the whole empire are fully authorized to forward the alms thus obtained, from time to time, to the central direction of this religious institution at Vienna.

8. The central direction at Vienna undertakes the grateful office of carrying into effect this pious work, under the protection of his most sacred majesty, and in connexion with Frederick Rese, now Vicar General of the Cincinnati bishopric in North America, and of employing the funds in the most efficacious manner to promote the glory of God and true faith in Jesus Christ; so that the alms collected by means of the most reverend ordinariates, or those sent immediately to them, shall be conscientiously applied, and in the most economical

Digitized by Google

manner, to the urgent want of American missions, as they are made known by authentic accounts and careful investigation.

9. The central direction will see, that all the members of the society, for their spiritual consolation and in reward for their pious zeal, shall be constantly informed of the progress and fruits of their munificence, as well as of the state of the Catholic religion in America, according to the accounts received.

10. The Leopold Foundation being a private religious institution, the central direction will solemnly celebrate the feast of the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin, the universal patroness of all religious assemblies, as the feast of the Foundation; but will also celebrate the feast of St. Leopold Marchion, the given name of the Empress Leopoldina and special patroness of this pious institution; and also every year on the 11th December, (the anniversary day of the death of Leopoldina empress of Brazil,) it will see that the solemn mass for the dead be said for the repose of her soul and all the souls of the deceased patrons and benefactors of the institution called by her name, all the members being invited to unite their pious prayers with the prayers of the direction.

11. His Holiness Pope Leo XII., eleven days before his most pious death, having declared his approbation of the institution, (which must serve as a great incitement to all good christians,) did grant to its members large indulgences, in an express letter, the publication of which being graciously permitted by his majesty on the 14th of April, was made by the most reverend ordinariates, to wit: "Full indulgence to each member on the day he joins the society—also, on the 8th December—also, on the day of the feast of St. Leopoldina, and once a month, if through the former month he shall have daily said a Pater and Ave, and the words, *Sancte Leopolde! ora pro nobis*, (St. Leopold! pray for us,) and on condition that after sincere confession he partake of the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, and pray to God in some public church for the unity of the christian princes, the extirpation of heresies, and the increase of Holy Mother Church."

12. The most serene and eminent Archduke Cardinal Rudolphus, Archbishop of Olmutz, has kindly taken the supreme direction of the Leopold Foundation, and appointed the most high and reverend lord prince archbishop of Vienna, his *locum tenens*.

Vienna, May 29.

THE POPE'S LETTER OF APPROBATION.

The following is the letter of approbation of Pope Leo XII., referred to above:—

Be it remembered, Although there are many things which disturb and grieve our mind in the most weighty discharge of our apostleship, while we learn that some are not only opposed to the Catholic religion, but seek to draw others also into error; yet the God of all consolation does not suffer us to be without solace, but alleviates the

Digitized by Google

labors, cares, and anxieties which we continually bear. This has recently happened, and we are filled with the highest joy, on hearing that in the kingdom of our well beloved son in Christ, Francis I., Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary, a society has been formed called the "Leopold Foundation," which is designed to aid the cause of missions. For what is more useful to a christian community, what is more excellent, than by the preaching the word of God to confirm the just, and to lead the wandering from the paths of vice to those of salvation? And, indeed, as the Apostle says, "How shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher, and how shall they preach except they be sent?" We, therefore, desiring to favor, as far as God permits, do, with a ready and willing mind, grant the requests which have been made for the endowment of the same with some holy indulgences. Therefore, trusting in the mercy of Almighty God, and the authority of Peter and Paul, his Apostles, we grant to all the truly penitent co-operators in this society, who shall confess their sins, and partake of the feast of the Lord's body, on the day on which they shall be received into the society, full indulgence and remission of all their sins. Also, we grant full indulgence to them after they shall have been cleansed from the pollutions of life by holy confession, and received the Eucharist, on the 8th of December, also on the day of the feast of St. Leopold, and once every month, provided that every day during the previous month, they shall have said the Lord's prayer, the salutation of the angel, and the words, "St. Leopold, pray for us," and in some public church have said pious prayers to God for the harmony of christian princes, the extirpation of heresies, and the glory of Holy Mother Church. These letters we endow with perpetual efficacy; and we order that the same authority be given to the copies of them, signed by the public notary and sealed with the seal of the person of proper ecclesiastical dignity, as is given to our permission in this very diploma.

Dated at Rome, at St. Peter's, under the ring of the fisherman, on the 30th day of January, 1829, in the sixth year of our pontificate.

T. CARD. BERNETTI.

This apostolic letter is sanctioned by the royal leave.

By his Sacred Imperial Royal Majesty.

VINCENTIUS SCHUBERT.

Vienna, 29th April, 1829.

As there has recently been much said on the subject of the Roman Catholic effort, with a reference to the ultimate establishment of their politics in America, we have thought it due to our readers to lay before them the whole premises which have given rise to the present alarm on the subject of the Austrian Mission.

While we agree with our Presbyterian friends in supposing it not impossible, nor even very improbable, but that the Pope contemplates the establishment of the "true faith" in the Valley of the Mississippi,

Digitized by Google

and that such an event is practicable under the co-operation of certain chances; we must, however, dissent from the hue and cry of bitter denunciation with which the Mother Church has been assailed by her ungrateful progeny. The alarmists, agitators, and panic-makers in these United States are all expert and well disciplined bands, whether in church or state. They seem well to understand the elements of society—when to raise the tempest, and when to allay the storm.

If there be a plot on hand (as perhaps there is) to supplant Protestantism and free government in our country, the fierce denunciatory and vindictive spirit with which it is met, is not in keeping with the philosophy of religion, morality, or sound policy. We shall endeavor to state all facts in the case, and then leave them with the public for consideration. *Edit. Mill. Harb.*

Last General Assembly.

HAVING a desire to see this elect church representative in full assembly met, I repaired to Pittsburg at the time appointed, and had the pleasure of surveying within the walls of Dr. Herron's old tabernacle, all the Presbyterial Israel of the American Union, in solemn conclave sitting in the persons of some two hundred Preaching and Ruling Elders; with the superaddition of a few of the Professors and Teachers of the Colleges and Schools Theologic, sacred to the cause of the Presbyterian Church.

A very venerable and respectable looking church is the Presbyterian, seen in the mirror of so many aged and grave Doctors of Divinity. The profusion of titles, however, which decorate the chiefs of this body, has not produced a corresponding profusion of talent; nor have the sacred honors bestowed by the Colleges been free from the capriciousness which is said by them of old times to mark the gifts of fortune: for here sits an officer with the epaulet and honors of *double divinity*, eclipsed by a preacher on whose humble name no College has vouchsafed a shred of parchment. Here again is that proverb verified, which says, "The race is not to the swift, the battle to the strong; *favor to the wise*, nor riches to men of understanding; but time and chance happen to them all." Taking into one view the animal, intellectual, and literary profile of these two hundred and twenty elect angels, it may be said that they are a fair sample, and no more than a medium sample, of the American people in the 19th century. There were not a few very grave and "*clever*" men in the assembly—such as Dr. Miller of Princeton, and Mr. Barnes of Philadelphia; and some "*right smart*" men—such as Dr. Ely of Philadelphia, and Dr. Junkin of Fayette College.

The "*lay*" part of the delegation appeared quite respectable, and generally well selected. The President of the Assembly, as far as respected the "outward man," did honor to the chair, and presided with both tact and dignity.

Digitized by Google

Considering the frailty of human nature, and the frailty of the constitution of the Presbyterian church, at this trying hour, when light and knowledge are advancing upon the outposts of the ancient heresies consecrated in the parliamentary reforms in the era of the Charles's; —considering, moreover, the struggling of the twins now in the womb of this modern Rebecca, concerning which there are many fears that the elder shall serve the younger: I say, considering all these frailties, the Assembly, upon the whole, decently behaved itself, and did not often fall into disorder.

I do not recollect ever to have seen any Assembly of Divines who less perverted or less misapplied the Holy Scriptures.

During the first three days of my attendance I did not hear one sentence quoted from Old Testament or New, in all the proceedings of the house. Towards the evening of the fourth day I heard one verse quoted—not exactly, however, as it reads in any version in Britain or America. But even then, and under all disadvantage, it afforded me some pleasure to find that four days could not be consumed by the Presbyterian church without once doing homage to the Holy Scriptures. I saw a little book in the hands of almost every member, which was often opened, often quoted; but, unfortunately for the honor of the house, it was not the Old or New Testament, the Psalms of David, nor the Psalms of Dr. Watts. Can you believe it, reader? —it was not Jefferson's Manual, but the Rules of the House, and a sort of ecclesiastic ritual for the business and the technicalities of the General Assembly. The members were not even too well acquainted with this little treatise, inasmuch as it appears to be the supreme law of the Legislature of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

It gives me no pleasure to state that the biblical attainments of the Assembly appear to be little or nothing in advance of the most uneducated Conferences and Associations in the land. God's Book is not studied because men's books are so numerous, so fascinating, so much better suited to the corrupt taste of a very degenerate age. It fell upon my ear with no ordinary surprise, when one of the most gifted and most conspicuous members of the house, in justification of some phraseologic indiscretion, replied, that "Jesus himself called Peter a *Devil*." This was not true in fact; for *Satan* and *Devil* are two very different epithets, though applicable to one agent; and whilst the former was in point as respected Peter, the latter, in the case alluded to, was any thing but true or pertinent.

The parties in the Assembly are not growing in love towards one another; and were it not that they are afraid of each other concerning the Schools, the Colleges, the Libraries, the Funds, &c. &c. I am of opinion, that there is not in the Confession of Faith a bond of union strong enough to hold them in communion for twelve months. But there are some golden arguments, which, till matters can be better arranged, may keep the General Assembly *in the eye of law*, and of the people, one and undivided.

EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

Mr. Broaddus---Good Conscience---Good Character.

WALKERTOWN, *King & Queen Co, June*, 1835.

BROTHER CAMPBELL—

Dear Sir:—My long silence, I hope, will create no mistrust of my alienation of affection from you, or the good cause in which you are so ardently engaged. Disease of the body has a wonderful influence over the mind, as all who have labored under chronic complaints will testify. My last communication in the Harbinger, for October last, informed you of my diseased condition. Since then, I have suffered much: but without the aid of any physician, I thank my heavenly Father, I am now as fat and hearty, as I ever expect or need be. My restoration from so destructive a disease, was affected alone by the use of Dr. Thompson's *Botanic remedies and Steam.*

While thus confined, I seldom ever saw the *one-sided* mouth-piece of the Baptists—the Herald. A few days past, an intelligent and much beloved disciple, put into my hands some numbers of that paper, containing three Essays of Elder A. Broaddus, with a request for me to notice his duplicity.

In a Herald of October, 1834, he brings in under his *text*, "*reformation*,"—which, he says, "means improvement—*Pastoral improvement;*" and says, "there is *great need* of it *in himself.*" This fact, I most conscientiously believe to be the truth. But when we see, or think we see the hand of deception in this confession, how nauseous it is to us. The evidence of this deception is manifest. He has disclaimed fellowship with the disciples of Jesus Christ, because they were bold enough to point out the necessity of his reforming from his errors. Can he be a disciple of Jesus Christ, who is offended with another for speaking the truth to him or of him before his face? This admission, we doubt not, was made to exalt himself in the eyes of his admirers. If this is not the fact, and the confession is an honest and sincere one, why does he not reform from the most corrupting principle ever practised by men professing the Christian religion? There is no sin, in my judgment, so destructive in its nature, to the *salvation of the world*, as the one he maintains. It is the essence of Popery. However he may condemn Popery, so long as he maintains this corrupting principle, we shall feel justified in classing him with the Papist. Notwithstanding his thanking God "he has lived to see much of the darkness hung (which he helped to put there) around the work of conversion, dispelled; and that God is putting it into the hearts and mouths of his servants to discard the *notion*, the *legal idea*--that it requires *months, weeks*, or *days*, to prepare to do what one *can* to be converted; how much more (he says) consistent with the tenor and grace of the gospel, to call on sinners *now to repent*, and to yield their hearts to Christ, than to sing the lullaby (his own song,) Do what you *can* my friends, and wait in the use of means." What shall

Digitized by Google

we say of such language? Does he intend by this to revoke *his King & Queen decrees*, which grew out of our calling upon sinners immediately to obey the gospel of Jesus Christ, upon their faith and repentance, and some of his congregation hearkened and obeyed? Or does he intend to call us the servants of God, and thank God we have taught him more perfectly the way of conversion, and yet treat us as heretics? Or does he mean to call us God's people, because we have for years called upon sinners immediately to obey the gospel? Mr. Broaddus will not deny, that he has condemned us for proclaiming these things in his ears, for six or seven years past. If he does, we shall produce some documents from his own hand writing, to convince him he has not "repented and yielded his heart to Christ."

His opposition to controversy, we know, grows out of a full persuasion, that if his hearers were to understand the apostolic gospel, his sermonizing to them would be a useless thing. That he has nothing to gain by "the truth of the gospel" being brought to bear upon their practice, but every thing to loose. This is the real cause of the sects' and their one-sided editors' opposition to controversy, and that "fiery pugnacious spirit" in them. Truth fears no investigation, and its advocates are willing to come to the light, that it may be made manifest their works are wrought in God.

In his Essay of January 16th, 1835, I could but smile when I read it: speaking of Baptism, he says, "If, indeed, *the plain expressed will of Christ* cannot be complied with, *I would have no substitute:* he does not require impossibilities, and to put a thing of *human invention in any case whatever*, in the place of a positive institute, is a gratuitous offering which he will reject. But if the irregularity consist in mere *circumstances* not *radically affecting the ordinance itself*, it may according to my view be exercised, and the performance deemed valid." Let us take a peep at his own conduct, in a few out of many things. I ask, are not the congregations of Jesus Christ required by a positive established law, or settled order, that they shall all be one in Christ Jesus? If so, is not the *Baptist, as a sect, a "human invention,"* of course, only a "*substitute*" for the church of God? And does not their making *their opinions* paramount to the word of God, by creating sects prove their religion to be of "*human invention,*" and a "*substitute*" for the Christian religion? Let them undertake to deny these things, and we will rivet them upon them. Where is the will of Christ plainly expressed, to justify him in the Baptist worship? We say, No where. Then he has "human inventions and a substitute." The ministry is also an established institute, springing from the congregations, who have raised and educated them, and sent them forth to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation to all men, and will support them. Where has Christ expressed plainly his will, that the *Baptists should have fairs to collect money from the wicked, to educate the teachers of Christianity, in theological sectarian schools?* Is this not a "human invention and a substitute?" We might ask them for the "plainly ex-

Digitized by Google

pressed will of Christ" for their being pastors of four churches—their calling councils to corrupt or destroy the standing of the servants of Christ—their associations to issue their decrees against all that doubted the infallibility of their opinions. But we will put Broaddus to the blush. Did not Peter "plainly express the will of Christ," when he immersed for the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit? Can there be any salvation without remission of sins? And is there any part of the will of Christ more "plainly expressed," than when Peter required all penitent believers to be immersed for the remission of their sins? If so, then he being judge, there is no salvation without obeying the "plainly expressed will of Jesus Christ," though he has taught men otherwise, and has rendered the word of God of non-effect, by saying, "Baptism is a mere outward bodily act." Thus he "radically affects the ordinance itself," in the minds of vast numbers. Many were about to be immersed upon their reading the Extra on Remission of Sins, among the Paido-baptists. But so soon as his Extra Examined came out, they joined with him and said, "A leading Baptist elder makes baptism nothing more, than 'a mere outward bodily action,' and so do we." No man living has changed the positive institute of Jesus Christ more than Elder Broaddus has done. Witness the conduct of the Baptists towards those that practise what he professes, and all the sects; and then say, if you can, what evil fruit *this tree* has brought forth.

But what grieved me most, was, when I remembered his condemning me in calling for "express language from the New Testament, chapter, and verse," for the unscriptural dogmas of a special influence before faith, which he considered too, of vital importance. Let his answer edify your readers—"Why, my good sir, can you refer me to any express language, chapter, and verse, which disallows to a man the liberty of having three wives at once, or, if you please, a half dozen; yet you and we would say the New Testament does certainly prohibit such a thing." I referred him to Matt. xix. 4—6; 1 Cor. vii. 2; and Heb. xiii. 4. He replied, "That is enough." To talk about "the plain expressed will of Christ," and having no "human inventions or substitutes, when he gives all the evidence we could ask of him, that he is governed entirely in his conduct towards the disciples, by "human institutions and substitutes," for the teaching of Jesus Christ, is a perfect mockery of principles or the Bible.

I have said, *he maintains a corrupting principle.* As the Harbinger is generally bound, and this may go to future generations, permit me to make my assertion good. A man, or any set of men, that deprives another either by fear, force, or fraud, of his property or money, is deemed a corrupt man—a dishonest man. If he be an officer of the government, the penalty is the heavier, as it is presumed he knows what he is doing. Now as all good men value their *conscience* and their *character* above all gold and silver; for to try to deprive one of these because they have a force sufficient to do so,

Digitized by Google

must be a crime of greater turpitude to him that knows what he is about, than to force from a man his money or property. Such has been the conduct of Elder Broaddus and some of the Baptists. What was his Salem resolution, King & Queen decrees, and association anathemas for, but to force us to acknowledge that their "human inventions and substitutes" were the will of Christ, or destroy our christian character? Now, I ask, if any of those brethren denounced in the Dover anathema, had said they were sorry for having incurred their displeasure, by doubting their standing; whether or not they would not have restored them, though they verily believed in their hearts, if they did not say so, that the Baptists had made void the great portion of the christian religion, by their "human inventions and substitutes?" We doubt not, hundreds have thus disgraced themselves, by defiling their consciences. We know a few, both preachers and people, like Esau, sold their birth-right, to escape exclusion. I ask, if a pure conscience is not the most invaluable and sacred right a man possesses? Now, if I exercise all the powers of my understanding upon the evidence before me, and form my judgment according to what I honestly believe to be the truth; to be *over awed*, by fear of exclusion, because a majority is against me, and surrender up my judgment to an opponent that cannot produce any evidence that I am wrong;—is not this to corrupt the most sacred principle man possesses? There is no escape from this shamefully corrupt principle, and defiling practice of the sects. To act up to our conscientious duty to God, *unless it meets the approbation of their preachers*, is at once to expose ourselves to their destroying hand, if we will not defile our consciences by surrendering up our convictions of truth, and duty too, *to them*. This is evidently a corrupting principle. Look at the church of Rome, down to the lowest proscribing sect; and the evidence is as bright as noon day. I have been particular on this point, believing a proscribing sect, for an honest difference of opinion among intelligent orderly members, is the greatest curse to the christian religion, that has entered the "church" since the days of Adam. I have been almost persuaded this is the influence of the Man of Sin, that was to have a corrupt progeny, springing from the "Old Mother of Harlots." We are free from it.

In his communication of the 13th Feb. last, upon the subject of teaching the colored people, (which is an important subject, and I wish it could be effected, so as to enable them to better understand, and do the will of Christ, than they now do,) he often speaks of the interest and well being of the human family, and of "*Bible instruction.*" Hear him. "Do you wish to promote the best interest—the spiritual and eternal well being of *any portion* of the human race, that may come within the range of your benevolent operations? If so, permit me to say, *it may be done.*" Are we no part of the human race? If so, why has he tried to destroy our well being, by forbidding us to worship God with immersed believers, or force us to form a sect, which act he knows would be unscriptural. Can I believe such

Digitized by Google

a profession of his "promoting the well being—spiritual and eternal interest of *any portion* of the human race?" and says, "it may be done;" and yet he does not move one step towards a reconciliation with those whom he has so deeply involved himself. *All his professions for the Bible*, must appear to every disinterested thinking man, a mockery, or an empty show to cover some scheme for selfish purposes.

Some may ask, Why speak so much of Elder Andrew Broaddus' doings? I answer, Because I am persuaded he has done more to injure the well being of men, than *any man living around us.*

Yours sincerely,

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

RE-IMMERSION.

LETTER FROM A CORRESPONDENT IN EASTERN VIRGINIA.

F——, August 1st, 1835.

Dear brother Campbell,

I HAVE been disturbed in my mind by some recent occurrences in this part of Virginia. Dr. *Thomas*, I take it for granted you know, has been preaching and practising re-immersion: brother *Anderson*, of Spottsylvania, a very excellent brother as we supposed for a long time back, has, within a few days, declared he was yet in his sins, and went to Dr. Thomas to be immersed for the remission of his sins. This has caused myself and some others to stumble, and greatly scandalized the cause of reformation. Indeed, I believe that several of the deacons of the Richmond church have been re-immersed; for I am told that the Doctor has published it to the world.

Several sisters have spoken to me to write to you on the subject, and to request your advice. They are not satisfied with their Regular Baptist immersion, but cannot say that they regard themselves as in their sins; and cannot see on what authority, or for what reason, they should now be asked to put on that Christ whom they acknowledged more than ten years ago, and whom they have endeavored to obey in all things according to the best of their knowledge. But at the same time they agree with me in declaring that if they are convinced that they are now in their sins, like heathen men and publicans, and that they are not citizens of Christ's kingdom, but aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, without God and without Christ—they would gladly be immersed again and again.

That you may have our case fairly before you, I will state, that when we were immersed and joined the church in F——, we believed in Jesus as the only Son of God and the only Saviour of the world, and concluded that we had the remission of our sins through faith in his blood, and were desirous of being buried with him and of rising with him, to walk in him; but did not understand baptism as for the remission of sins, or as a sign and pledge from God of our pardon. We have had some dark and cloudy days, it is true, since we made a profession of our faith: but since our views have been corrected and enlarged, we feel quite happy in coming to God through that Jesus who is our advocate (as we still believe) with the Father, and who can have a right measure of compassion upon the ignorant and erring.

We have always received the cup of salvation as a sign and pledge of the remission of our sins, and unless it should appear that our *mistakes* have actually made us aliens, and cut us off from fellowship with Christ, we cannot see how we could mend the matter by nullifying our profession and beginning

Digitized by Google

again. And should our views be farther enlarged, it would appear to us that we should, on the same principle, be unhappy again, unless we did again nullify our profession and be immersed in accordance with our conceptions. In one word, have we any authority from the New Testament to be immersed because of our education, and could we *now* come to the water with any assurance that baptism would be to us what it was to the Pentecostian converts?

A private answer would be most acceptable to us; but as we have reason to think that under the present excitement it might be advisable to make it public—if, in your judgment you think so, let my epistle appear over the signature of SUSAN.

REPLY.

SISTER SUSAN,

Dear Madam—I CAN find nothing in the New Testament more analogous to the case you have stated, than that recorded in the 15th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles:—"In the mean time, *some*, who came down from Judea, taught *the brethren*, Except you be circumcised, *according to the manner of Moses, you cannot be saved.*"

It was with no ordinary feelings of regret and mortification too, that I saw, a few weeks since, an intimation in the "Apostolic Advocate," to the church in Baltimore, that they ought to re-immerse all who came over to them from the Baptists. It was alleged that the church was inconsistent in demanding a declaration of faith from the applicants for membership coming from the sect of the Baptists. To correct this alleged error, our much esteemed and very ardent brother Thomas exhorted them not only to have a re-confession of faith, but to immerse them again. If the Apostle Paul had said so, then indeed we should all have acquiesced.

I have no faith in that philosophy that reforms one error by multiplication, or even by simple addition. A church may, indeed, on receiving an applicant without a letter of recommendation, demand of that person a declaration of his faith, and proof that he has been immersed into Christ; but to require of every such applicant a statement of his views of each and every fact and ordinance in the Christian Institution; or to command every such person, without examination, to nullify his former profession and to be baptized for the remission of his sins, is, indeed, to paganize all immersed persons, and to place the world, the whole world, Jew, Gentile, and Christian, just as it was on the day of Pentecost.

For my part, although I have been reluctantly constrained to think that the remnant, according to the election of grace, in this age of apostacy, is, indeed, small, yet I thank God that his promise has not failed—that even at this present time there is an election—a remnant—and that this remnant did not commence either in 1827, 1823, or in 1809.

Although the Baptists, the Waldenses, Albigenses, &c. &c. have not always had the clearest views, the best views, nor the purest morals; and although the self-honored *Regular* Baptists have treated myself and brethren neither with christian spirit nor with christian manners, yet God forbid that I should so resent their follies, their weaknesses, or their sins, as to place them on the same footing with the Papists of the 10th century, or with the Mahometans of the 19th; and because some hot-headed zealots among them have re-immersed some who have left our churches and joined theirs, that we should, by way of reprisals, re-immerse those who conscientiously dissent from them because of their declension from the knowledge, zeal, and purity of their fathers, or because of their present Laodicean state as respects the apostolic institution. No—we are not prepared for such measures as these.

That the Baptists are greatly degenerate, and fast immersing themselves into the popular errors of this age, I am sorry to confess as my sincere conviction in the presence of God; but among these hundreds of thousands there are some tens that have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal, and are as worthy citizens of the kingdom of the Messiah as any of our brethren.

But to come directly to the burthen of your epistle: I have only time and room to say a very few things. Some few persons in this country, have, under the impulse of their new discoveries, been re-immersed; but they generally were immersed at night, or in secret. But in the ardor of our *young* brethren in Virginia, and in their zeal for the truth, they have not only re-immersed in open day, but published to the world the prevalence of these ultraisms, and registered the converts.

I need not tell you that I have not only a very great esteem for brother Thomas and brother Albert Anderson, but a most ardent affection for them; and had they made these bold, and, at best, doubtful measures, matters of privacy, I could not have been induced to have either inserted your letter or published this reply to it. But much as I love and esteem these brethren, I esteem and love the Twelve Apostles and the cause of my Lord and Master more; and, therefore, I must say, *that the preaching up of re-immersion to the citizens of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, for the remission of their sins*, is wholly ultra our views of reformation; and, in our judgment, wholly unauthorized by the New Testament.

And am I asked, *Who is a citizen of the kingdom of heaven?* I answer, Every one that believes in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah the Son of God, and publicly confesses his faith in his death for our sins, in his burial and resurrection, by an immersion into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Every such person is a *constitutional* citizen of Christ's kingdom.

If every one that does not clearly understand the meaning of baptism at the time of his immersion, or afterwards, is, on that account, an alien and "in his sins;" then were the Apostles very remiss in not preaching re-immersion to the church of God in Rome: for Paul had to explain to them the meaning of baptism, chapter vi.—then was Paul very negligent in not constraining "the carnal" Corinthians, the ignorant and superstitious Corinthians, whose consciences were not healed from all the imbecilities of idolatry, to be re-immersed. And ought he not to have re-immersed the Galatians, of whom he "stood in doubt," and for whom "he travailed again in birth till Christ should be formed in them," and to whom he expounded the meaning of baptism? (ch. iii. 27.) On this point much could, and, perhaps, much ought to be said; but we will not enter with spirit into it, believing it to be unnecessary. Suffice it here to say, that the notion of re-baptism is wholly out of the Record, and is only an *inference* drawn from our own conclusions on the present state of christianity, and the inadequate conception of many professors on the import of the Christian Institution.

He that comes to the water of baptism for remission, must believe that he is yet in his sins, and that till that moment he was in the same *state*, as respected God and Christ, as were the Jews and Gentiles, to whom the gospel was first preached in the apostolic age. And if our brethren must be addressed as in their sins, who did not at the time of their confession of Christ fully understand christian immersion, in what point of view are all their prayers and praises, and communion in the Lord's death, &c. to be regarded; and where shall we find the promise for the remission of such sins by being again immersed!! Where there is no promise there can be no accomplishment; and, therefore, the joy of enthusiasm is the joy of those who have put off Christ to put him on again.

Instead of this, much better they had gone and brought forth fruits worthy of reformation—confessed their errors, and asked forgiveness through that Mediator whom they had publicly acknowledged, and who has never made the clearness of any person's conceptions the condition of the benefits of his death, resurrection, and high priesthood in heaven. Then, indeed, they would have had better and more valid proofs of genuine discipleship than in having been twice immersed.

We have always said, and we say it again, that persons who were immersed without faith in Jesus as the Messiah, on believing should be immersed into his death. They differ nothing from immersed infants. And if a person has been

Digitized by Google

immersed solely into his own experience or conceit, instead of into Christ, as we believe sometimes happens—then, indeed, as respects christian immersion, that person is as one unimmersed. But this is wholly different from the case alleged; for upon the principle assumed in these re-immersions, I could find as many of those who were once immersed for the remission of sins that need to be immersed again, on every view of the matter that can be taken, as of those who, from among the Baptists, have already been re-immersed.

I very much regret the occasion that has called for these remarks; and I am sure these very zealous and excellent young brethren will not feel more sensitive in reading them, than I have felt in reading of them, and from them, not only in the *Apostolic Advocate*, but in the *Religious Herald* which accompanied your letter. If what I have written is not fully satisfactory, let me hear from you again; for I have much more to say on this subject.

Very affectionately, EDITOR.

P. S. Here follows the notice from the Baptist *Religious Herald*:—

"*Reformation and Re-baptism.*

"Knowing that this system had been fostered and kept alive by opposition, we have avoided for some time past, noticing either the inconsistencies or progress of what is termed the Reformation. We should not in the present instance have departed from our usual course, had not something like a new era in its history occurred recently in our city

"We allude to the new theory advanced by Dr. Thomas, their bishop or teacher in this place. Improving on the theory of Mr. Campbell, the Doctor has discovered that the baptism administered by the Regular Baptists is of no more account or validity than the sprinkling of the Pedobaptists. That baptism is an unmeaning ceremony, unless the candidate is immersed for the remission of sins, and unless the subject is baptized for the remission of sins, he is still unregenerated and unconverted.

"Acting in accordance with these views, Dr. Thomas has recently re-baptized one of his fellow-teachers, Mr. Albert Anderson, of Spottsylvania, and three of the deacons, with other members of the Sycamore church in this place. These individuals had been previously baptized by the Regular Baptists.

"It has been aptly observed, that one error begets another. It is like straying from the right path in a journey—the deviation from the true course is increased by each progressive step. The advocates of the Reformation have lost themselves in a boundless wilderness, and every footstep leads them into a more inextricable labyrinth. The path of error is always downward and progressive."

"Fostered and kept alive by opposition"! And has your opposition ceased, Mr. Editor? No: you find you cannot oppose more effectually than you do. You recommend opposition according to your views of what is most effectual. This "new era" is an old era on the part of your opposition: for have not some of your brethren, long since, re-immersed some of those immersed by our brethren? I do not believe that the case of which you speak was from the spirit of retaliation; though I think your re-immersions were for, and from contempt. Do I err? Pardon me. I speak what I think. You are not to blame for the ultra measures of your brethren. Neither am I. Show me, then, that respect I show you, by publishing my reply to Mrs Susan ———. We only wish you to cease your opposition, and to take the advice which Gamaliel gave to the Doctors. Know, O man! that for all these things you shall be judged, and before a tribunal over which popular opinion shall have no weight. Your friend, THE EDITOR.

Challenge Accepted.

JAMES TOWN, O. *June* 10, 1835.

Brother Campbell,

A BROTHER recently put into my hands a pamphlet, written against the scriptures, by a Mr. Wm. Johnson of Pennsylvania, to a Methodist preacher, containing five letters. In the second letter, Mr. Johnson endeavors to prove that Moses was not the writer of the Pentateuch, but that it was written several hundred years after Moses' day, by one Hilkiah, "who

took his own time time to compose or compile it, as might best suit his own purposes." Should a poor credulous christian be so bold as to assert a proposition, that he cannot demonstrate as clearly as he can that every right angle contains ninety degrees; he becomes the butt of ridicule by the profound logicians of scepticism. But where is the demonstration of the above proposition? Why, it is to be found in a few *perhapses* and *suppositions* drawn from a few detached passages found in the Pentateuch. "But what is conclusive," says our writer, "that the Pentateuch could not have been written by Moses, comprising as it does a large volume, is, that there were only two modes of writing known to Moses; one by cutting the words in stone, and the other by tracing them in soft mortar or plaster; which last method he expressly recommends to the Jews." Now the corollary that our sceptic would draw from the above is, that it was impossible for Moses to have written as large a volume as the Pentateuch, from the fact, that no building could have contained the stone upon which it would have been written. Bro. Campbell, will you be so kind as to make some remarks as to the manner in which the Pentateuch was written?

Mr. Johnson in his third letter, adduces seventy contradictory passages from the Jewish scriptures. These consist chiefly of comparisons, metaphors, allegories, similes, metonomies, synecdoches, ironies, hyperboles, &c., that are to be found in the Jewish scriptures, and of which they abound in great variety. The conclusion to which our writer comes is, that he has "demonstrated that the Bible makers have attributed to God all the faculties of the human body:" that because God is represented as possessing all the faculties of the human body, therefore he is really in the possession of them; that because God is spoken of as having eyes, therefore he really has such eyes as man; that as he is represented by the figure of a lion, therefore he is a lion, &c. Yes, this seems to be the ground upon which Mr. Johnson has had the hardihood to assert, that the Scriptures are a bundle of contradictions, and that they represent God as "a peevish old man, a gardener, a tyrant, a tailor, a house builder, a butcher, a grave digger, a schoolmaster," &c. Mr. Johnson seems to have forgotten that *things unknown can only be known by things already known*, or never to have known it. If he would pay attention to this, we think it would remove a great deal of his scepticism. This seems to be one of the great blunders of sceptics. They would have God make his revelations to man through some other medium than human language, which would be impossible, unless man was made differently from what he is.

Mr. Johnson in his last letter, becomes quite sanguine as to the effects his little pamphlet would produce. He says, "Yes, sir, even this little tract, although compiled by an illiterate shoemaker, (who, by the by, was once a "Rev." as well as yourself,) will make more convicts (converts, I suppose he means,) to the principles of Infidelity, than all the wind and money that was spent (were spent) at your camp-meeting will make to Priestcraft. But it is human nature to be prepossessed in favor of its own abilities.

In the last letter is also a premium of *five hundred dollars* offered to any clergyman, who will prove the following propositions: 1st. 'That the gospels were written by the persons whose names they bear;' or, 2d. 'That they were written within half a century of the time the events therein recorded are said to have taken place;' or, 3d. 'That the persons of whom they treat, to wit, Jesus and his twelve disciples, ever existed;' 4th and last, 'That the principle and most important facts and events as therein recorded, ever happened.'

Our young sceptics are beginning to fulminate louder, than their old king Mr. Owen: but as he failed in carrying his point by reason, it may be they can carry theirs by loud noise.

W. J. WILSON.

Digitized by Google

REPLY.

Solomon in his proverbs, chap. xxvi. v. 5, commands me to answer Mr. Johnson in the followsng manner: Let Mr. Johnson stake his five hundred dollars in the hands of the Sheriff of any county in Pennsylvania, Ohio, or Virginia: then let that Sheriff summon twelve free holders of good common sense, not one of them a professor of the Christian religion—and I will engage to prove that Moses wrote the Pentateuch; and that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John wrote what is commonly called the four gospels—to the conviction of at least seven out of the twelve: provided only, that it can be proved to those seven, that Martin Luther, John Calvin, Tacitus, Livy, Julius Cesar, Sallust, Virgil, Homer, Plutarch, Herodotus, Diodorus, Josephus, wrote the works which bear their names. And I will covenant and agree, that the said five hundred dollars when awarded to me, shall be given to the Bible Society. Let W. Johnson now retract his proposition or say that he is a hypocrite—or redeem his pledge.

A. CAMPBELL.

CONVERSATIONS IN FATHER GOODAL'S FAMILY CIRCLE, AT THOMAS GOODAL'S.

A HIATUS having occurred in the original copy of these conversations, we now find the company at the house of Thomas Goodal, eldest son of Samuel Goodal. We moreover discover a mistake in our transcript from the original manuscript. We said in the first number, that these conversations occurred in "the first week;" it should have been the first "two weeks" of the year 1800. This was discovered on finding the whole company at Thomas Goodal's on the 11th day of the year. We also find that we have not only the conversations of the six evenings of 1800, but also two conversations in the year 1801. In one of these we have an account of the conversion and marriage of Mr. Williamson.

Father Goodal.—I have the honor to introduce to the company, an old acquaintance from Wales, Mr. William Wickliffe; and a distant relative of his, Mr. John Hooker, lately returned from a visit to Geneva. They are the only surviving male descendants of two of the most distinguished reformers in the reign of Edward VI.

Mr. Reed.—I am peculiarly happy in taking by the hand, the living representatives of the two great and good men whose names they bear, and whose blood they inherit. But is not Mr. Wickliffe descended from a more remote and a more renowned ancestor than any of the reformers of the age of Edward?

Father Goodal—Mr. Wickliffe can speak for himself, but I have understood that he is more immediately related to John Rogers than to John Wickliffe. How is it Mr. Wickliffe? We are all anxious to know.

Mr. Wickliffe—My mother was a descendant of one of the ten children of John Rogers, who was burned at Smithfield, Feb. 4, 1555. As to my father's relation to John Wickliffe, I am not so certain. John Wickliffe had no children, never having been married according to the Romanist custom of his day. It is indeed a tradition in our family, that my father was the fourteenth in descent from William Wickliffe, the brother of John; but this has not been established fully to my satisfaction. That we are connected, however, with the family of John Wickliffe, is probable; for both my grandfather and great-grandfather lived and died on the same estate in the vicinity of Lutterworth, the parish where the Lollards were formerly so numerous, and over which John Wickliffe once presided.

Mr. Reed.—And is Mr. Hooker a direct lineal descendant of the famous bishop Hooker, father of the Non Conformists?

Digitized by Google

Mr. Hooker.—So say the church registers in the towns of Gloucester, England, and in the parish church of Kildare, Ireland, where my forefathers have long resided.

Mr. Reed.—The young people around me are very curious to learn from our strange but welcome guests, some of the particulars of these families, so intimately connected with the history of the Protestant Reformation. Robert Fowler, I, Foster and Thomas Reed, are calling for the history of the Lollards, in which they read so much about John Wickliffe. Will our friend Mr. Wickliffe, who is doubtless well acquainted with those matters, which both his religion and family connexions have rendered so interesting and made so familiar, entertain us with an account of that great and good man, who is usually and I think deservedly called "THE MORNING STAR OF THE REFORMATION."

Mr. Wickliffe.—Desirous as I am to contribute to the gratification of my young friends in their inquiries into church history, and especially into the history of the Protestant Reformation, I do not think that I can render them any essential service on this part of it; as all or almost all that I have learned by tradition, is now extant in various works, some of which are presented in a very familiar form to the apprehension of young students.

Father Goodal.—However that may be, your devotion and attention to ecclesiastic affairs (which I know eminently qualify you,) will greatly enhance any information you may please to convey; and I may add, that hearing it from your own lips, will more indelibly impress it upon all our recollections, than reading it leisurely in retirement on the pages of a dead historian. I am greatly in favor of the living voice; and of oral rather than of written lessons on all matters of great interest. Besides, it will be as interesting to myself, and I presume all present, to have a narrative of the great men and the great incidents of that amazing revolution, which has already so greatly blessed, and which is yet still more extensively to bless, the human family.

Mr. Hooker.—Yes, Father Goodal, you are right; and our friend here has, I know, looked as closely into the history of the last three hundred years, as most men now living; and I must tell you, he has more than once delivered lectures on the Protestant Reformation, both in England and Switzerland, much to the edification and admiration of very intelligent audiences.

Mr. Wickliffe.—Come now, Mr. Hooker, you will eminently disqualify me for proceeding with interest in this matter: you will raise the expectations of the company, and I will only disappoint them. You are yourself more conversant with these subjects than myself; and you have for as many years as I, been speaking and writing on these very themes. I will then move that you be laid under tribute to assist in this entertainment, and to furnish your supplies when I fail to satisfy the interest and curiosity which you have awakened.

Mr. Reed.—I second that motion. Mr. Wickliffe and I think it will carry, as the Latins say, *nemine contradicente.*

Father Goodal.—Let us have it in English, Mr. Reed. We are all English people.

Mr. Reed. In English: No one voting against it.

Father Goodal.—Will you then proceed? for I divine from all eyes and ears, that you have the suffrage of all the company.

Mr. Wickliffe.—Where, then, shall I begin?

Mr. Reed.—With the times of Wickliffe, if you please.

Mr. Wickliffe.—You do not expect a lecture, I hope!

Mr. Reed.—We will relieve you by propounding questions, when the occasion requires.

Mr. Wickliffe.—England in the fourteenth century, with the rest of Europe, was groaning under the bondage, ignorance, superstition, and tyranny of the Roman Pontiffs, supported by hordes of rapacious priests and ecclesiastics, whose indiscribable ignorance was only equalled by their infamous morals. The monorchs and princes of the west, instigated by the pontiffs of Rome, aided by the power of superstition, and the influence of indulgencies,

Digitized by Google

were unable to renew the war in Palestine against the Turks and Saracens, through the avarice and ambition of the ghostly rulers of the church.

The Missionaries of the Cross, as they were called, in China and Tartary, reported immense conquests over the idolatries of the east. *Te deums* were sung in cathedrals for the compulsory conversion of multitudes of Jews in Germany and France, while the Pontiffs and their cardinals confessed that the Turks and Tartars extirpated their christianity in many of the best provinces of Asia.

Learning seemed to revive, if a long list of writers on grammar, history, law and physic, are to be admitted in evidence; or, if a crowd of mathematicians and philosophers in the school of Aristotle is proof: but on all hands it was confessed, that society was in no perceptible degree benefited by their literary labors.

The Realists and Nominalists renewed their feuds, and astrology, magic, and mysticism were studied with intense avidity.

Philip, king of France, and Pope Boniface VIII. were at the greatest variance; but the ghostly majesty of the pontificate fell before the king, and the pope died overcome with insults and indignities. The conclaves in electing the popes to fill St. Peter's chair, were distracted with fierce contentions, which finally terminated in what is called the *"great western schism,"* there being two popes reigning at one time.

After Gregory XI. expired, Urban VI. and Clement VII. reigned simultaneously; the former at Rome, the latter at Avignon, in France. Nor can it be decided from all that is written, which of them was the true pope and real vicar of Christ. Urban died in 1389, and Clement in 1394, and were succeeded by two popes;—the successor of Urban was Boniface IX., while Benedict XIII. filled the chair of Clement VII. Charles VI. settled the controversy for a time, by confining Benedict XIII. as a prisoner in his palace at Avignon.

During this period, the mendicant monks swarmed like locusts. These sturdy beggars controlled the church, and robbed the people; yet the majority believed that if they could die associated with these impudent wretches, they would obtain mercy in the day of judgment.

England, to save itself from being devoured by the insatiate appetites of the popes and clergy, in the reign of Richard II., passed the famous statute of *praemunire;* which statute put out of the king's protection, all those who purchased from the court of Rome religious livings, or any other instruments to rob the English subjects of their property; or whoever brought them to England, or did receive or execute them. This measure was the first check to the rapacious advances of the court of Rome on the realm of England.

Such was the aspect of affairs on the continent of Europe and in England during the fourteenth century, in which flourished that said John Wickliffe, born in 1324, and died in 1384, barely completing his threescore years.

Born at Wickliffe, near Richmond in Yorkshire, and educated in Queen's College, Oxford, he became Divinity Professor in that university, and finally pastor of Lutterworth, in Leicestershire. He was sometime Fellow of Merton college. He wrote about two hundred tracts. While Divinity Professor at Oxford, he published a treatise against *transubstantiation;* another against the *infallibility* of the pope. He wrote against the church of Rome as the head of all churches; and contended that Peter was not prince of the other Apostles; that the New Testament is a perfect rule of faith and manners; and that it ought to be read by all the people.

He also contended, that in the New Testament there were but two offices, and but two orders of public servants; viz: bishops and deacons. "I do boldly say," observes he, "that in the time of Paul, *fuit idem presbyter atque episcopus;*" that is, that presbyter or elder, and bishop, were the same: "for," continues he, "in those times, the distinct orders of popes, cardinals, patriarchs, arch-bishops, bishops, arch-deacons, officials and deans, were not invented." He averred that all "human traditions are superfluous and sinful;"

Digitized by Google

that "we must practise and teach only the laws of Christ; that all mystical and significant ceremonies in religious worship are unlawful; and all restraints as to forms of prayer prescribed, is contrary to the liberty which we have in Christ." He inveighed against the temporal grandeur of the prelates, and their usurped authority.

Mr. Reed.—I am requested to ask, How could he with impunity promulge these doctrines in the college at such a time?

Mr. Wickliffe.—The doctrines were sent to Rome, and condemned by Gregory XI., in a consistory of twenty-three cardinals, A. D. 1378. But the death of the pope put a stop to the process. His successor, Urban, wrote to King Richard II., to the arch-bishop of Canterbury, and to the university of Oxford, to put a stop to the progress of *Wickliffism*. He was sometimes cited before the arch-bishop and the prelates, but by the interest of his friends in London, powerful in their influence, he was dismissed. Sometimes the lords in court, and sometimes special providences, rescued him from the hands of his enemies. But in 1382, a convocation of bishops in London, called by the arch-bishop of Canterbury, condemned his doctrines, and deprrived him of his professorship: his books and writings were ordered to be burnt, and himself to be imprisoned.

Mr. Fowler.—Was he cast into prison?

Mr, Wickliffe.—No: he kept out of the way; and in his retirement, wrote a confession of his faith to the pope, and declared to him that he was willing to defend his views at Rome, if God had not visited him with sickness, and various infirmities. But the warm controversy then pending between the two anti-popes, the one at Rome, and the other at Avignon, about which of them was the vicar of Christ, was the grand means of his being permitted to die at home in his own bed. He wrote with his own hand about two hundred volumes, besides his translation of the New Testament into English.

Robert Fowler.—I read somewhere, if I am not mistaken, that he was burned.

Mr. Wickliffe.—Forty-one years after his death, his bones were dug up by order of the council of Constance, 1425, which, together with his writings that were gathered in, were burned to ashes.

Mr. Read.—Will you please explain, why so long after his death they were so indignant against his mortal remains?

Mr. Wickliffe.—His doctrines and his new translation did so much mischief to the clergy, that they were incensed against his memory. His followers increased rapidly after his decease, and this occasioned some very severe laws against heretics.

Mr. Reed.—Was his translation much read?

Mr. Wickliffe.—The art of printing not then invented, but few copies of it could get into circulation; but these were read with intense interest.

Robert Fowler.—I do not recollect to have read much about the Wickliffites in the history of the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries.

Mr Wickliffe.—His followers were not called Wickliffites, but *Lollards*.

Robert Fowler.—Why called *Lollards?*

Mr. Wickliffe.—Not from *Walter Lollard*, as some historians maintain: but because the word *Lollard* signifies one that *sings in a low voice*, mournful songs or dirges: it was applied to a party that arose in this century, who, in times of the plagues which were frequent, waited on the sick, buried the dead, and practised acts of mercy and charity. These, the followers of Wickliffe resembling, because of their much singing of hymns or sacred songs, humming as they attended upon business or as they walked along the way, obtained for them the appellation of *Lullards* or *Lollards*.

Mr. Reed.—Did not this party become so formidable, as to occasion several laws to be passed against them in the next century?

Mr. Wickliffe.—In the reign of Henry IV., and early in the reign of Henry V., laws were passed against heretics, and one specially against the Lollards,

Digitized by Google

in which this clause was found: "Whosoever shall read the Scriptures in the mother tongue or Wickliffe's learning, shall forfeit land, cattle, life, and goods, from their heirs for ever; and be condemned for heretics to God, enemies to the crown, and most arrant traitors to the land." So great and so general was the alarm, that every sheriff was sworn "that he should seek to repress all errors and heresies, commonly called Lollards." This continued in the oaths of the sheriffs of England till the time of Charles I., when Sir Edward Coke, on being appointed sheriff of the county of Buckingham, objected to it, and ever since it has been left out.*

Father Goodal.—The doctrines of Wickliffe then, differed little or nothing from the doctrines of the Protestant Reformation.

Mr. Wickliffe.—So little, that some have identified them with the doctrines of the Puritans. His capital offence was urging the reading of the Scriptures upon the common people, not one in a thousand of whom had before seen them, he having impiously translated them into English; and his boldly affirming that there were only bishops and deacons in Christ's church.

Robert Fowler.—Was there no English Testament before John Wickliffe translated the Greek, about the middle of the fourteenth century!

Mr. Wickliffe.—Wickliffe's translation from the *Latin Vulgate*, was the first English version ever made.

Robert Fowler.—And how did the English people learn religion: could they all read Latin?

Mr. Wickliffe.—From the priest's lips; who preached to them in their mother tongue, prayed for them in Latin, and read, or promised to read the Bible for them at home!

Mrs. Reed.—My whole frame thrills, when I think of a nation, and especially the nation of our fore-fathers, in the keeping of such a horde of arrant knaves and impostors, as were a large majority of those priests of the pope,—most unsafe guardians for the souls of those, whose persons and estates they pillaged on earth.

Mr. Wickliffe.—Indeed, Madam, if we could be translated back only three hundred years, and live a few months in that society, we would think that the Protestant Reformation, with all its imperfections, is one of the most signal blessings which God has bestowed on these isles of the sea, since Jesus Christ left the world.

EDITOR.

BAPTIST INHOSPITALITY.

THE Rev. Mr. *Hoby*, of England, a delegate to a Baptist Convention in Richmond, in April or May last, after visiting the principal cities on the seaboard, made a tour to Illinois, and returned as far as Cincinnati on the 3d of July last. Preaching on every First day, and more frequently in the most exemplary Baptist churches as he passed along, never saw within his reach the symbols of the Lord's death till he reached Cincinnati! "The *Cross*" (not of Christ) and the "Baptist Journal," (Regular,) of the 10th July, testifies as follows:—

"The Rev. Mr. Hoby, one of the Baptist delegation from England to this country, arrived in this city on his return from Illinois on Friday of last week. In the afternoon of Lord's day the members of the Sixth street Baptist Church united with the Enon Church in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Mr.

* *When any unjust law or statute is introduced, it is often permitted to live in the statute book long after its political death. We have some as absurd laws (obsolete indeed.) in our statute books, as was that against the Lollards in the time of Sir Edward Coke.*

Digitized by Google

Hoby remarked it was the *first communion season he had enjoyed since his arrival in this country*, and expressed great gratification in being permitted here to unite with those who acknowledge the same Master and cherish the same views in this PLEASING SOLEMN SERVICE"!!

Thus the good man met with no communion season from Richmond to New York, from New England to Illinois, in all his travels in the Baptist churches! Cincinnati had the honor of affording him one opportunity for attending on this *pleasing solemn service!* The disciples in old times came together upon the first day of the week to break the loaf; but now a christian preacher may travel thousands of miles, and spend months among Baptist disciples, and not hit on one "*communion season.*" And still the preachers and some of the people say things are just as they ought to be in the Baptist denomination—no reformation needed!! EDITOR.

CONFORMITY TO THE WORLD.

Brother Campbell—

I HAVE recently been thinking on the duty we owe to society at large, and, particularly, the obligations we, as christians, are under to our children. I should like to know whether or not it is lawful for those who profess to be laboring to restore christianity to its original purity, both in doctrine and practice, to follow what is called the fashionable amusements of the age—such as sending our children to Balls and Dancing Schools? You know that Paul says, that "whatever we do, in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God. even the Father, by him." Now the inquiry is, Can parents who send their children to dancing schools, honestly say they do it in the name of the Lord Jesus? And can they devoutly thank God that he, in his kind providence, has blessed them with plenty of the unrighteous mammon thus to educate their sons and daughters? And farther, can they, with grace in their hearts, thank God for the graceful facility with which their children *hop* about the room at the sound of the violin? Again, does the divine injunction on parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, admit of parents encouraging their children in all the vanities and follies of the day? Or does it mean, as some of us have been in the habit of thinking, that christian parents are bound, as far as possible, to instil the principles of christianity into their tender minds, and restrain, as far as possible, those committed to their charge, from the vanities and follies of the world? We would like to hear your views on these things, in all plainness; for some of us do not feel pleasant under the present state of things.

A Lover of Christian Behaviour.

THE very statement of the question in our brother's communication is a suitable answer to it. To which I need only add a song for a christian dance.

A New Version of an Old Song.

Thus says the Prophet of the Turk:—
Good musselman, abstain from pork;
There is a part in every swine
No friend or follower of mine
May taste, whate'er his inclination,
Upon pain of excommunication.
Such Mahomet's mysterious charge,
And thus he left the point at large.
Had he the sinful part express'd,
They might with safety eat the rest;
But for one piece they thought it hard
From the whole hog to be debarr'd;
And set their wit at work to find
What joint the Prophet had in mind.
Much controversy straight arose—
These choose the back—the belly those;

Digitized by Google

By some 'tis confidently said,
He meant not to forbid the head;
While others at that doctrine rail,
And piously prefer the tail.
Thus conscience freed from ev'ry clog,
Mahometans eat up the hog.
You laugh. 'Tis well: The tale appli'd,
May make you laugh on t'other side.
Renounce the world, the preacher cries;
We do, a multitude replies.
While one as innocent regards
A snug and friendly game at cards;
And one, whatever you may say,
Can see no evil in a play:
Some love a concert or a race;
And others shooting, and the chace;
E'en dames, their fortunes to enhance,
Will have their children learn to dance,
And ape the fashions late from France.
Revil'd and lov'd, renounc'd and follow'd,
Thus, bit by bit, the world is swallow'd;
Each thinks his neighbor makes too free,
Yet likes a slice as well as he:
With sophistry their sauce they sweeten,
Till quite from tail to snout 'tis eaten.

RELIGIOUS HERALD OF JULY 10.

"VIEWS OF MR. A. CAMPBELL.

Dear brother Sands—

FROM a boy, I was desirous of becoming a christian; and by the blessing of God, was permitted a few years ago to enjoy the hopes of the gospel. I then concluded I had found that inestimable treasure upon which I might rely for permanent bliss, and rejoiced with exceeding great joy. But, ah! I was not long permitted to remain in peace. The views of Mr. C. were then making no small stir in the region where I was, and knowing him to be a distinguished man, I thirsted to read his writings. It occurred to me that I ought first to become acquainted with the Bible, and then compare his views with it, instead of carrying the Bible to his writings; but I gave way to my desire. I bought his *Christian Baptist*, and perused it; and conceiving there was much plausibility in his statements, I was carried far away. The errors which he pointed out i various sects, appeared plain; the notion of discarding all human creeds and traditions, of rejecting all of men's works and taking the Bible alone as our guide, seemed lovely indeed. And thus sitting at the feet of my leader, I imagined myself to have reached a summit in christian knowledge from which I might look down on the various sects around me with utter contempt. I was ready for controversy, attacking any and every body who came in my way. Really, Mr. C. was almost with me "all in all." In devotion, I recollect on one occasion that he was between me and the Lord, and I used then to pray, perhaps, as often that his life might be preserved, as I do now that his eyes may be opened. Still there were two things, with all my predilections for him, which it was hard for me to swallow; his *rough* treatment of his *opponents*, and the *desire* which he manifested to be *famous* as a *reformer*. All this time I enjoyed but little peace of mind, for I was so soured against christians on account of their supposed ignorance and errors, that I had but little fellowship among them. But as God in his great mercy would have it, I was rebuked by my church, admonished and affectionately labored with by kind brethren. My eyes began to be opened, and the 1st, 2d, and 3d verses of the 3d chapter of Revelations, I became so convinced were applicable to the ungodly notions of Mr. Campbell, that I gave up both him and his writings. Blessed be God, I do hope that I am now entirely delivered of him, and pray that I may never again be entangled in this most *dangerous* heresy. Since my

Digitized by Google

change, I have had that spiritual enjoyment to which I was before almost an entire stranger. And although by the great mercy of the Lord, I have had repeated manifestations of my acceptance with him, yet I have often looked back on this part of my conduct with fear and trembling. In my past life I find many errors, but none I so much regret as the mistake I made in this matter. Dear reader, are you in the least degree partial to his peculiarities? Discard them as things which are intended to mar your peace, and carry you from your God and Saviour. Be admonished, be entreated, be warned by one who *feels* much, and who has *suffered* much, to reject with firmness the notions of this most unfortunate and infatuated man. To deny our experience, and the operations of the Holy Spirit, are most serious matters indeed. May the Lord preserve you and all of his people from these, and all other errors, and may he bring Mr. C. and his adherents to repentance! A BAPTIST.

June 26th, 1835."

The best comment I have now to offer on the above, is, that it is without a name; and, therefore, the author being ashamed of it, we ought not to be shamed by it. A certain *Daniel Griffing*, down in the Mississippi country, was also induced by a caucus (of clergy, I think,) to renounce his attachments to the *Christian Baptist*. He signed his recantation. It was trumpeted like the dying testimony of *Spencer Clack*, from North to South, as a good argument against our cause. It was *religiously Heralded* as a signal trophy of the truth over error. But in a few months afterwards, this good and conscientious Daniel Griffing renounced the Baptist creed as erroneous and unscriptural, and joined the Methodists as the true church. But of this fact the Baptist Editors made no proclamation, nor sang any *Te Deums* in their churches, nor ever gave it as a proof of the unsoundness of their tenets. I do not impute to this anonymous cypher any bad motives inducing him to recantation; but until we know his name (if he have any) we must regard his turning aside as Paul did that of Demas. Probably there were not wanting in the days of Jesus and Paul persons to commend even Judas and Demas as honest men.

EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

FREDERICKSBURG, August 12, 1835?

FOR the last two weeks I have been in Virginia, making proclamation. Seventeen have not only heard, but obeyed; and these of the most influential members of society. Thanks to the name of Jesus! We held a three days meeting at the Rappahannock Meeting-House, which was indeed a joyful meeting. The disciples were filled with joy and a holy spirit. Their hearts were knit together in love while they were using the means God has given for the conversion of the world—viz. the proclamation of the gospel. We were happy in the acquaintance and christian intercourse of the beloved veteran brother Henley, whose looks and changing locks proclaim a long warfare against man's mortal foe. Brother Richards, too, we found at his post, braving all the dangers consequent upon a well known declaration of hostilities against all humanisms in religion. Brother Du Val, the Doctor, we found busily employed both for soul and body, determined to understand and teach the christian institution as it is; hence he is probing the *systems* sorely. May the Lord help him! Amen. Brother Fife is still devoted to the truth and anxiously laboring for better times. The disciples here, all of them, have entangled my heart with the cord of love. Somehow there is a great deal in the Virginia brethren's feelings congenial to my own. We seem to suit at first sight. We had a meeting at Smyrna, which was well attended. Here we saw brother Pendleton's home and enjoyed his hospitality. From here we went to Antioch, where we were carried by the kindness of brother Roy. This was the

Digitized by Google

annual co-operation meeting. Here we met beloved brethren Bagby, Albert and Henry Anderson. I spoke on Saturday morning, and brother Du Val in the afternoon. On first day morning we met to converse about sending forth an Evangelist—when, to my surprise, your humble servant was chose to do this work for the churches. I concluded that if I could bring my business to a close, I would serve them, and make me a permanent home in Old Virginia. O that I were more capable for the work, and more worthy of the brethren's confidence!

JAMES HENSHALL.

MARTINSBURG, Ky. August 5, 1835.

I have travelled all this Spring and Summer trying to turn the attention of my fellow-men to the gospel that was successful eighteen hundred years ago. Some few have been added in every trip I have made, but the additions have not been large. I will inform you that about fifteen persons united in this neighborhood a little more than twelve months ago under gospel government, and the number is now said to be about sixty, who meet the first day of every week to attend to the ordinances of our King, and I hope they are growing in favor and knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. The good work is spreading to some extent in many places. The truth is gaining ground while its opposers are enraged, and are using all their powers in trying to prop their decaying systems.

JOHN MULKEY.

LOUISA, Va. August 13, 1835.

The first of the month we had a three days meeting at Bethany. Brethren Higgason, Webber, and Bagby were our public speakers. On Sunday they addressed a very large and attentive audience. Some good was done. At the close of the meeting three made the confession: one was an old Methodist lady. She said she had not enjoyed any satisfaction for a long time. We expect several more will be immersed soon. I heard that a Mr. Smith rode from Richmond to brother Webber's the other day to be immersed. Brother Thomas was gone out on a preaching tour. I have heard that James Goss and Lindsey Coleman of Albemarle have come over to the "reformation." If so, it is a considerable acquisition to our cause."

N. W. TURNER.

GOOCHLAND, June 29, 1835.

I have been wishing to be able to give you a true history of things among us, though I have not been, neither is it in my power yet. We have been endeavoring to make some advancement in the order and manner of our worship; and for that purpose we have been organized with Elders and Deacons at Dover, Webster's, and Ground Squirrel. The brethren seem to be satisfied that the primitive churches were thus organized. We have two orders of Elders, as we are taught in the Epistles—one who rules, and one who labors in word and teaching as well as rules. We worship the Father through the Son by the Spirit, break the loaf, and partake of the cup when we meet on the Lord's day, and contribute as we have been prospered during the week. One of the greatest difficulties is to get the brethren to meet without a minister or some one who is regularly in the habit of speaking. In fact, such is the effect of our having had called and sent men among us, who alone could interpret the Scriptures, that some of our Elders, who are more able to teach than many of the above named class, will sometimes prefer going to hear such and not meet with their own brethren; and so of many of our members too. Though there is such manifest difference between those who profess to be called and sent, who preach their experiences, and those who proclaim the word, that I think the orthodox, will have to use some other means of obtaining a knowledge of God's will than their ministry, and our brethren will be content to meet together and engage in the worship of the Lord for their own edification and for the instruction of their families.

I fear we have been hindered in our progress by our teachers not giving sufficient attention to the Scriptures. It is impossible for one to teach what he has not understood; and if we are to plead for a scriptural faith and practice,

Digitized by Google

we must know what a scriptural faith and practice are, which we can only know by reading the good Book. And many among us spend too much time in telling what others teach, rather than telling what Christ and the Apostles have taught. If our young brethren in the ministry would simply teach what is plainly written, and tell their audiences where they may read all they say, it would tend more to promote the cause we plead. As we desire those who profess to have a scriptural knowledge of what they profess, to prevent their feeling from being so fluctuating, let them know their duty and do it, and their feeling would be uniform. MATTHEW W. WEBBER.

PARIS, Tenn., July 16, 1835.

I now take up my pen to inform you of the progress of reform in this country, which I rejoice to say, has lately been rapid and extensive. Our able and beloved young brother, Allen Kendrick, has been laboring among us during two or three weeks, until a week past, when he was compelled to leave for other places and home in Alabama. In the short space of upwards of one week, he immersed fifteen for the remission of sins; three at Crooked creek, Carroll county, about fifteen miles from here; ten at this place, and two in the county. Two Baptists also united with us about the same time; one, an old mother in the Lord, the other, an old father, an able "layman," who had his eyes opened to the truth by reading the Millennial Harbinger, and is very zealous and "able to teach." Some weeks since, I immersed two at this place for the remission of sins; and on the fourth Lord's day in June, one at Reedy creek in Carroll county, about eight miles south of Huntingdon, where I formed a congregation of seventeen: we then chose and set apart an elder, two deacons, and an amiable zealous young brother of some promise for a proclaimer. This is the *third* congregation of Christ in Carroll county, which has been formed upon the Word of God, as their bond of union and sole rule of faith and practice.

But in the midst of our prosperity, we have not been exempt from affliction. Our worthy and beloved old father in the Lord, Wilds Cooke, was suddenly called away from us by death, a week or two since. He was in his 71st year, and had been long very deaf and infirm. He came here from Kentucky, where he was brought from being a rigid Calvinistic Baptist, to receive and follow the truth of the gospel, through the instrumentality of the Christian Baptist. But few "laymen" had a more profound and accurate knowledge of the holy writings of the Apostles and Prophets, and had juster views, or understood better, the great principles of the Christian religion. But his dust reposes in its mother earth, where it will remain until the glorious morn of the never-ending day of eternity, when "his corruption shall put on incorruption—his mortal, immortality—death be swallowed up in victory," and he shall bloom for ever in immortal youth and vigor! Praised be the name of the Lord for his abundant mercies, and the blessed hope of a glorious immortality! It is this hope "which we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and entering into the place within the veil, where a forerunner has entered on our account; even Jesus, made a High Priest for ever." As a ship secured by a good and firm anchor, rides in safety upon the waves of the ocean, however agitated by storms and tempests,—so does the christian, who has laid hold on this hope, ride safely and sublimely upon the waves of the ocean of time, amidst the tempests and commotions of the world, in the *ark* of the new covenant, guided and steered by the *helm* of faith, according to the *compass* of the word of God!

I spent a few days not long since with old father John Hooten, of Hickman county. He is entirely illiterate, not knowing all the letters of the alphabet, but mighty in the Scriptures, full of zeal and fervent in piety. He informed me that during the last *six months*, he had immersed about *one hundred and forty* at two places alone—Buffalo river and Crooked creek, in Perry county, Tennessee. At the former place, he immersed not long since an old Presbyterian, who had been a member of that church forty years, and whose

Digitized by Google

life had been so blameless during that time, that aught could not be alleged against him. He had for some years been reading the Bible for himself, untrammelled by sectarian views and prejudices, and as might be expected in such a case, had formed just views of the divine volume. The first time he heard the ancient gospel proclaimed, he recognised it, and went forward and obeyed it, warmly exhorting others to do the same.

JOHN R. HOWARD.

P. S. *Mormonism.* The organ of Mormonism, the "Latter Day Saint's Messenger and Advocate," published at Kirtland, Ohio, has the following in it in a letter, signed "Warren Parrish and Wilford Woodruff, and dated May 16, at Paris—We have baptized twenty-nine since we wrote you last, making the several branches that we have planted in this vicinity, sixty-four." This same Parrish, under date of Feb. 1st, Paris, Henry county, Tenn., says, "In all there have been thirty-five baptized, and united with this church." In another paper which I have not before me, I think he states that their church here had forty-five in it. I will now state the truth myself. They have but four members in this place; not another that I know of nearer than about eight or ten miles, and not more than half a dozen that I know of nearer than fifteen or twenty miles! And these are the men that are making such pretensions to the immediate inspiration, guidance, and gifts of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit of God guides into all truth; but the spirit of Mormonism, *alias* Joe Smith, guides into error, delusion, and misrepresentation! These men, Parrish and Woodruff, say, "scourgings, imprisonment, and death are threatened." If this is so, I know not by whom. They have preached and spoke what they please here unmolested, and for a good while past not much heard or listened to.

J. R. H.

I have just returned from a visit to New Castle, Henry county, Ky., where brother Wm. Morton and I preached two weeks, aided a few of the last days by brethren J. Creath sen. and J. Smith. Seventy-five citizens of the town and neighborhood were immersed for the remission of their sins. During our visit, the congregation in New Castle and Palmyra, four miles from town, received an accession of about ninety members, immersed, and from the Baptists, Methodists, &c.

B. F. HALL.

A letter from J. P. Lancaster informs, that 15 or 20 miles below Elizabethtown, he held a meeting of several days, at which he received some Baptists, Methodists, and a gentleman who had been raised a Catholic. Six were immersed. They were constituted into a congregation of Christ, and appointed elders and deacons to go into the ancient order of things.

Letters omitted shall appear in our next.

BAPTISM.

MANY Tracts, Sermons, Reviews, &c. along with many requests from correspondents on the subject of infant church membership and infant sprinkling, have been received here within two years: to none of which have we paid any attention. The reason is, we have said so much on these topics long since; and our debates with Mr. M'Calla and Mr. Walker, in our judgment, have never been answered. In them will be found a full refutation of all the Paidobaptist arguments. The M'Calla Debate is now for sale at 75 cents; and nothing has been written by the Paidobaptists since, which is not fully met in that volume. The subject, the action, and the meaning of this institution, are fully stated, illustrated, and proved in that debate.—*Ed.*

APOLOGY TO THE REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

OUR good brother *M'Corkle* has not acceded to the proposition of alternate replication. To do justice to our correspondents, and to the public, we have decided on the following course: We shall delay the essays of the Reformed Clergyman till the numbers on hand of brother M'Corkle are published; then we shall hear the Reformed Clergyman as long—and with that close the concern. The subject will then be exhausted so far as these correspondents are at issue. We shall then likely give our views of the merits of the controversy.—*Ed.*

☞ We have more essays on hand from different quarters than would fill a duodecimo volume. We have withheld his regular series to make room for some of them, and yet we are behind our expectations for the present number. Brother *William Jones'* letter for May, or his No. 4, is to hand, and will appear in our next. Mr. *Meredith*, of North Carolina, came too late for appearance at this time, as this number was nearly all in type on the 15th day of August.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number X.——Volume VI.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. October, 1835.

Reply to a Reformed Clergyman---No. 5.

BY S. M. M'CORKLE, A LAYMAN.

I WILL be brief in answering the Reformed Clergyman's No. 5, although headed by an imposing motto—"*The Lord coming in a cloud.*"

Summing up his arguments, they amount to this:—"That there is not a word or phrase in the English, or any other language, of considerable importance, or frequency of occurrence, that is not sometimes used figuratively;"—"that the phrase 'coming in a cloud' does not always mean a literal cloud;"—"that 'coming in the clouds of heaven,' or 'coming with power and glory,' are phrases indicative of the same thing;"—and "that 'coming in the clouds of heaven,' or 'in a cloud,' or 'riding on a swift cloud,' does not always mean what it literally says." Here our friend tacitly admits that it commonly means *just* what it says!

Suppose the above positions be admitted, have they set the matter at rest? Is it proved that the Lord is not literally to descend, as he literally ascended? Our friend has left the matter at loose ends, without putting his finger on the solitary passage which *must* be figurative, or the one that *may* be literal.

In all historical parts of holy writ, where a cloud is mentioned, it always means a literal cloud. Paul speaks of a "cloud of witnesses." Here the word *cloud* is manifestly a figure.

I will notice our friend's remarks on the words "come quickly." According to his argument, because the words are used at the beginning and at the close of the vision, they of necessity must relate to

Digitized by Google

objects or time two thousand years apart. I, as a common sense man, can see no impropriety in giving the same admonition at the close of the vision that was given at its introduction.

A much greater difficulty is presented to our theory in our friend's query about the heaven in Matthew xxiv. 29, 30. Our friend passes over the passage with a *query;* and I very much doubt the possibility of his applying the two verses, either figuratively or literally, in his theory, coupled together. Let him take either side, and we stand pledged to throw insuperable difficulties in his way. Of the two verses under consideration, no doubt but the one relates to the heaven alluded to, Rev. vi. 12. A relative to the other may be found, Acts i. 9, 10, 11.

Our friend says, "Some of the literalists make a difference between the 'coming of the Son of man,' and the coming of his kingdom." This he proves by Matth. xvi. 28. Mark ix. 1. "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man come in his kingdom." Mark says, "Till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Will any of the spiritualizers undertake to prove that these passages have not been literally fulfilled by the Master's actual presence for the space of forty days after his resurrection, and the power attendant on the introduction of this very kingdom?

No. 6.

Disappointment is always in wait for the anticipations of poor short-sighted man. The imposing head in our friend's 5th number caught our eager eye. After reading, re-reading, and reading again, demonstration, or any thing tangible, like the *ignis fatuus*, was still far ahead. Hope caught a little buoyancy from the last clause in the number: "In my next essay I shall attempt to show not only what *the man of sin* is, but prove that the Lord will destroy him by *the brightness* of his coming." The essay came; but hungry hope was left hopeless. Our friend, by dint of argument and scripture, spread upon five or six pages, has proved what all Protestants admit—an almost self-evident fact—that his Holiness the Pope is *the man of sin!* His Holiness of Rome is properly the representative of the son of perdition; but more of this hereafter.

On this ground we can have no controversy; without issue be made on some other matter entirely foreign from our point of debate, and be called a *digression*, by way of offset against our friend's remarks about "novelty of an oplnion," being a sort of letter patent for its favorable reception. This is an implied censure on "obscure" laymen—to wit, common sense pretending to understand prophecy; and as likely to be right as any "expositor of prophecy, from Jerome to George Croley." Now, sir, the time has been, is now, and will be, if the Master's presence does not prevent, when truth will be called "a novelty"—"a first born of Satan." This was the case in a reformation from Popery, and is now the case in a second reformation—a

Digitized by Google

reformation from Protestantism! Old truth is now treated as it was in the days of Luther—as *new error*.

Setting the Bible aside, my next most infallible criterion for judging right and wrong, is this: Is the opinion popular? Does the doctrine or usage obtain the common approbation of the sects? If these questions be answered in the affirmative, for the sake of truth I would commonly take the negative. The history of truth in all ages will bear me out in this, as a general remark. Old opinions, usages, or denominations: oblique, yearly still farther from the true point of truth. Unlike magnetical influence, they are destined never to return.

Now, sir, without a novel, or rather a new theory, the meaning of prophecy is not to be known this side doomsday: the old ones, especially those on the Apocalypse, being ridiculously absurd. Commentators, as well as the clergy, have contributed no little toward making God's word unintelligible.

The sayings of our friend occasionally call up to mind the "odor of his first wine"—the sins of the clergy, the most arrogant class of men on earth: they think their divine right invaded, their special privilege outraged if common sense dare to understand the prophecies.

How few men, after a regular campaign at College, ever return back again to sober common sense. They become dazzled with the glare of science, and ever afterwards overlook the plain simple meaning of God's word; are apt to think, speak, and act as priests of old used to do relative to the common sense opinions about the Lord's Anointed and his word. "This people who know not the law, are accursed." The most useless members of the Lord's house, if an appendage of his house they can be, is a college bred dunce, dubbed into a Right Rev. D. D. Who but a learned man, and an Englishman at that, would have found a "French revolution" or a "Spanish armada" in the Apocalypse? No! a common sense Bible student might have read the Book till the age of Methusaleh without ever making the wonderful discovery! Where, within the lids of the Bible, can be found a precedent for calling *heathen idolatry*, HEAVEN?! or heathen gods, goddesses, and deified heroes, *the stars of heaven!!*

Now, sir, from College comes, with your "letter patent," the very men who have fabricated such monstrous absurdities, at which common sense would blush in the grave. I revere the learning which gave me in my mother tongue the "*Living Oracles*." Have we all the ideas in the original clearly conveyed? If these questions be answered in the affirmative, what advantage then can a Greek student have over his equal in the English? This places the Bible student on a perfect equality with the best linguist on earth. If a knowledge of Scripture depends on a knowledge of language dead and lost (except in books) for ages past, then has George Croley or my worthy friend a decided advantage over any "obscure layman." But it is a notorious fact that proficients in language have generally been as wretchedly deficient in the knowledge of Bible figures as they have been justly celebrated for letters. The schools may give a use of

Digitized by Google

language, but in the school of Christ alone is to be gained a proper use of those important figures so often found in the *Living Oracles*. Far be it from me to advocate the cause of ignorance: a common illiterate dunce in the pulpit, is a disgrace to the fraternity, or the church that gives a passport.* A man cannot long be ignorant who makes the Bible his daily companion, and is in possession of his *mother tongue*. The ignorance which has most harmed the church is of a different kind—more imposing—taken at those *Jack Lantern lights*, where men put on diplomatic divinity by *dint of Greek*—become "apt to teach" *kic hoc*-ing, and jabbering Latin for the acquisition of this important requisite in the economy of grace!

EVILS AND REMEDY OF SECTARIANISM.

NOTHING better proves the divinity of religion than the connexion, the harmony, the agreement of its component parts. I am aware that this grand characteristic of christianity has occasioned many mistakes among mankind. Under pretence that a religion proceeding from God must harmonize in its component parts, men have licentiously contrived a chain of propositions to please themselves. They have substituted a phantom of their own imagination for tha. body of doctrine which God has given us in the Holy Scriptures. Hence so much obstinacy in maintaining, after so much rashness and presumption in advancing such phantoms. For, my brethren, of all obstinate people, none excel more in their dreadful kind, than those who are prejudiced in favor of certain systems. A man who does not think himself capable of forming a connected system, can bear contradiction; because, if he be obliged to give up some of the propositions which he has advanced, some others which he embraces will not be disputed, and what remains may indemnify him for what he surrenders. But a man prepossessed with an imaginary system of his own, has seldom so much teachableness. He knows that if one link be taken away, his chain falls to pieces; and that there is no removing a single stone from his building without destroying the whole edifice.———Let us proceed to inquire why so many of us confine ourselves to a small number of religious truths, and incapacitate ourselves for examining the whole system.———

The first cause that we have assigned is a *party spirit*. This is a disposition that cannot be easily defined, and it would be difficult to include in a definition of it even its genus and species: it is a monstrous composition of all bad genuses and of all bad species; it is a hydra that reproduces while it seems to destroy itself, and which, when one head has been cut off, instantly produces a thousand more. Sometimes it is superstition, which inclines us to deify certain idols, and, after having formed, to prostrate first before them. Sometimes it is ignorance, which prevents our perceiving the importance of

* *I dont believe in the practice of Priests making Priests. 'Tis the business of a well organized church.*

Digitized by Google

some revealed truths, or the dreadful consequences that we had embraced in childhood. Sometimes it is arrogance, which rashly maintains whatever it has once advanced—advanced, perhaps, inconsiderately; but which will afterwards be resolutely defended till death, for no other reason but because it has been once asserted, and because it is too mortifying to yield, and say, *I am wrong—I was mistaken.* Sometimes it is a spirit of malice and barbarity, which abhors, exclaims against, persecutes, and would even exterminate all who dare contradict its oracular propositions. Oftener still it is the union of all these vices together. A party spirit is that disposition which envenoms so many hearts, separates so many families, divides so many societies, which has produced so many excommunications, thundered out so many anathemas, drawn up so many canons, assembled so many councils, and has been so often on the point of subverting the great work of the reformation, the noblest opposition that was ever formed against it.

This spirit, which we have faintly described, must naturally incapacitate a man for considering the whole of religion: it must naturally incline him to take it only by bits and shreds. On the other hand, it contracts the mind; for how can a soul that harbors and cherishes all the phantoms which a party spirit produces, how can such a soul study and meditate as religion requires? On the other hand, a party spirit depraves the heart, and eradicates the desire of knowing religion. A man animated with the spirit of party directs all his attention to such propositions of religion as seem to favor his erroneous opinions, and irregular passions, and diverts it from all that oppose them; his system includes only what strengthens his party, it is exclusive of every thing that weakens or opposes it.

This is the first cause of the malady. The remedy is easily discovered. Let us divest ourselves of a party spirit. Let us never determine an opinion by its agreement or disagreement with what our masters, our parents, or our teachers have inculcated, but by its conformity or contrariety to the doctrine of Jesus Christ and his Apostles. Let us never receive or reject a maxim because it favors or opposes our passions, but as it agrees with, or opposes the laws of that tribunal, the basis of which are justice and truth. Let us be fully convinced that our chief study should be to know what God determines, and to make his commands the only rules of our knowledge and practice.—*Saurin's Sermons.*

Letter from Elder William Jones.

No. IV.

London, May 20, 1835.

Very dear Friend and Brother!

TOWARDS the close of my last letter, the date of which was April 20, I intimated that I had something further to say to you on the subject of the Holy Spirit's operations on the minds of men, in the

Digitized by Google

way of enlightening their understandings into the saving knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, quickening them from a death in trespasses and sin, and moulding their hearts into the impress of the gospel, agreeable to 2 Cor. iv. 6. Eph. ii. 1. and Rom. vi. 17. To this subject I shall devote the present letter: but before I proceed further, allow me to say that the object I have in view is not so much the information and instruction of my brother Campbell, who needs none from me, but to get what I have to say introduced into the pages of your Journal, so that it may meet the eyes of its readers, whose attention has been probably less drawn to it than its importance demands.

I am perfectly aware of the disadvantage I labor under in following so able and accurate a writer as your correspondent PAULINUS, whose two Essays on the Influence of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men have done such justice to the subject as to render it almost presumptuous in me to resume it after him. The only apology I have to offer for touching upon it is its very great importance in the system of Christian doctrines, according to my view of the matter, and the hope that I may suggest a few things not unworthy the consideration of your readers.

I apprehend, then, that the word of God warrants us in contending for a marked distinction between divine teaching and such as is merely human, even in its most pure and perfect form. The former is one of the blessings promised in the new covenant which was made with all the elect, and ratified by the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. Hence it is written, Isa. liv. 13. "All the children shall be *taught of the Lord*." And we have the same promise, Jer. xxxi. 34. in the very bosom of the new covenant; for thus runs the record: "This shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts, and will be their God and they shall be my people: and they shall teach no more every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord." Here we see that divine teaching is distinguished from "every man's teaching his neighbor;" and as to the subject matter of tuition, we see it is the knowledge of God, the just God and the Saviour—the God of salvation; "they shall all know me, from the least unto the greatest of them."

Now, we find the great Prophet of the Christian Church, while in the discharge of his public ministry, quoting the words of Isaiah above mentioned, John vi. 45. and showing us the effects of this teaching. His words are, "It is written in the Prophets, 'And they shall be all taught of God: every man, therefore, that hath heard and hath *learned of the Father*, cometh unto me.' And this *coming* he explains afterwards to be neither less nor more than *believing* on him, as the true Messiah, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world," (verse 47.) or receiving the divine testimony concerning his person, mission, and work, all of which he resolves into his Father's *drawing*, (verse 44.) or its being *given* them of the Father to believe in his name, (ver. 65.)

Your correspondent PAULINUS has very satisfactorily shown the necessity of this divine teaching, or in other words, the work of the Holy Spirit, in order to make men wise unto salvation. Hence our Lord says, when commenting upon the promise in Isaiah, "No man can come unto me except it were given him of my Father." John vi. 65.: answerable to which the Apostle Paul thus writes: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." The doctrine of salvation through a crucified Redeemer is a stumbling block to the Jew and foolishness to the Greek—while to such as are *called*, or taught of God, it is both the wisdom of God and the power of God unto their salvation. It would be easy to multiply testimonies to the same purport, were it necessary, but what have been adduced may suffice to this end.

And now as respects the nature of this new covenant blessing, namely, divine teaching, it may be useful to make one general observation, which is, that it does not supersede the means which God hath appointed for instructing mankind in the knowledge of the truth; for "faith cometh by hearing," and "it pleases God, by (what men are pleased to call) the foolishness of preaching to save those that believe." What we contend for is, that divine teaching is *above* and *beyond* all human tuition, even of revelation itself; and it is the only thing which can give efficacy to human instruction, and crown with success those outward means which are of divine appointment: for "Paul may plant," or sow the seed—he may preach the word or doctrine of the kingdom, "and Apollos may water it, but God alone can give the increase." Hence we find the Saviour himself owning the sovereignty of God in communicating the knowledge of the saving truth to whomsoever it pleases him: "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, for so it seemed good in thy sight." Matth. xi. 28.

The Apostles were divinely commissioned to preach the gospel to every creature, and they had their Lord's promise that he would be with them always to give his word effect; yet we find them soliciting the prayers of their christian brethren, that they might not labor in vain, nor spend their strength for naught. They were pre-eminently qualified for the arduous undertaking by a full and clear understanding of the subject, for they preached with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. They had, moreover, the power of working miracles in confirmation of the truth of their testimony; for God bare them witness with signs, and wonders, and divers miracles and distributions of the Holy Spirit according to his own will. Yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, we hear them saying, "Paul may plant and Apollos water, but God giveth the increase." "Brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified." "We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us."

There are few things of greater importance to christians in general,

Digitized by Google

and to those who are called to bear office in the churches more particularly, than to be able to distinguish *divine* teaching from that which is purely *human:* but I have thought that the following characteristic properties and effects, if duly attended to, might assist us in discriminating between them.

1. Divine teaching, in which the Holy Spirit is the agent, and the word of truth the instrument or means, is always *effectual*: but it is not so with that which is merely human. Men may speak the real truths of God to the outward ear, and even communicate a theory of the system of evangelical doctrines, or a scientific knowledge of them to the judgment, but they cannot give a spiritual discernment to perceive the things of the Spirit of God. He alone can "give an understanding to know Him that is true." None but God can open the heart—rectify the very perceptive faculty—and speak immediately to our spirits by his word. Naturally, the human mind is like ancient chaos, full of darkness and disorder; and so the agency of an almighty hand in bringing a sinner out of darkness into the marvellous light of the gospel, is compared to the creating power whereby Jehovah first called the world into order, commanding the light to shine out of darkness, 2 Cor. iv. 6. Thus he shines into the human heart, giving the knowledge of his glory as it manifests itself in the person of his Son; and thus he discovers himself by his own light, just as the sun does in the natural world. "In thy light," says the Psalmist, "we shall see light." xxxvi. 9. Moreover, men may set forth the evidence of divine truth to one another with great clearness and power, but they cannot produce conviction in the mind of an unbeliever by means of that evidence. But the light which comes from God carries its own evidence along with it: for the God of truth makes himself manifest as the speaker, and so it comes "not in word only, but in power, and in the Holy Spirit, and in much assurance." 1 Thess. i. 5. Men may set forth in words, the beauty and loveliness of divine things, but they cannot communicate a view of their glory and excellency to the mind, so as to cause sinners to perceive and relish and love them supremely; and hence it is that we often find knowledge and love separated. Through divine teaching, the blessed God gives such a view of his character and grace in the great salvation, as effectually to attract the believer's supreme affections, and constrain him to love, admire, and glory in the blessed object.

2. Another property of divine teaching is, that it is *plain and simple;* conformably to which the Apostles, in preaching the gospel to the world, used "great plainness of speech." The philosophic wisdom and scholastic reasoning of men always perplex and obscure the simplicity of divine truth; and the more they think to investigate it in this way, the more manifest is their failure—the more do they involve themselves and others in darkness and intricacy. But divine teaching does not leave the mind to labored and ingenious investigation, or to a painful stretch of the judgment or reasoning faculties to comprehend it. It comes with a self-evidence and simplicity like the very principles of nature: so that every thing appears so plain and

Digitized by Google

simple, and at the same time so surprisingly grand and godlike, that the subject of it stands astonished at his former blindness and ignorance. Now, this method of instruction is peculiar to Him that made us—who created and has access to our spirits, and who knows how to shine into our hearts. This teaching, indeed, makes the simple wise unto salvation; but it also makes the reasoning philosopher a fool, that he may become wise in the simplicity of a little child.—Hence the saying of the Apostle Paul, "If any man amongst you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool that he may be wise, for the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God:—the Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise that they are vain." 1 Cor. iii. 19, 21. A blind philosopher may reason about the nature and properties of colors; but an illiterate rustic will have a more correct notion of them by a single glance of the eye! Such is the case in reference to divine truth with every one that is taught of God.

3. Divine truth is of an *humbling tendency*, and so also is divine teaching; and this is another of its properties whereby it may be distinguished from mere human tuition. The teaching theology as a science, which is the great purpose and business of our schools, academies, and colleges, has a manifest tendency to puff up the human heart with the pride of knowledge, and inflate the mind with a conceit of its comparative attainments. Hence, "the wise man glories in his wisdom." But divine teaching, as it manifests the glory and majesty of God to the soul, so it empties the creature of all his fancied self-importance, and lays the subject of it low in the dust, as an ignorant and polluted mortal before the eternal and incomprehensible Jehovah. We have in the Scripture many instances of the fact now mentioned. Such, for instance, is the case of Abraham—"Behold, now I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, who am but dust and ashes." Thus also it was with Job—"Behold, I am vile, what shall I answer thee? I will lay my hand upon my mouth. Once have I spoken, but I will not answer; yea, twice, but I will proceed no further. I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee; wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." And was not the case the same with the holy Prophet Isaiah, when in vision he was favored with a discovery of the glories of the Divine Majesty? "Woe is me! for I am undone: because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts." Chapter vi. verse 5.

4. Another property of divine teaching is, that it invariably *communicates satisfaction to the soul*. Mere human teaching leaves the mind still empty, and unsatisfied as to man's great interest and concern, or that which communicates rest, and peace, and happiness to the soul. It still leaves the subject of it under the painful inquiry, "What lack I yet?" or, "What good thing shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" And even though it should kindle in the mind some transient emotions of comfort, it is in the power of every wind of doctrine or of temptation to blast it. The reason of this is obvious,

Digitized by Google

Mere human teaching cannot of itself beget faith, or communicate to the soul a sense of the divine favor in the remission of sins, or purge the conscience from the guilt of them, and so give the sinner peace with God: it cannot implant the lively hope of eternal life, or bring the soul to peace and rest in reference to its great concern. But divine teaching does all this: and hence the promise to the children of Zion, who are the happy subjects of it, is, "Great shall be their peace."

5. Let me add to what I have said on this subject, that divine teaching is of a *transforming quality:* it never fails to produce sanctifying effects upon the subject of it, and to change him into the divine likeness—it renews the man after the image of his Creator. Hence we find the Apostle Paul thanking God in behalf of the Romans, that though they had been the servants of sin, yet now they were delivered into the mould of the gospel of christian doctrine, which had been preached among them, so as to take an impression of it upon their hearts and exhibit it in their lives. Rom. vi. 17. The glorious gospel was *engrafted* in their hearts, as the Apostle James expresses it, and they had taken the form or impression of it so as to be changed into its likeness; but all this was the effect of divine teaching; for that doctrine does not grow natively in the human heart; it is brought from elsewhere and *implanted*, in order that men may bring forth a new kind of fruit, corresponding to the nature of that which is engrafted. And this is the work of regeneration. Faith *working by love* is the new creature: the former will cast the soul into the mould of the doctrine believed, but it is love that assimilates or produces a conformity to that which is received; and this explains the difference between true faith and orthodox notions, or merely speculating on the doctrines of the gospel—a point of theology which some do not seem to understand. But, not to enlarge on this subject, let us hear the Apostle Paul's decision of the whole matter:—"And we all with unveiled face, beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Lord, the Spirit." 2 Cor. iii. 18. Hence we infer that the light of the glory of God, as manifested in the person and work of his beloved Son, shining into the hearts of believers, transforms them into the image of the object contemplated. But as mere human tuition, without the influence of the Lord, the Holy Spirit, cannot present the object to the mind, so it cannot of itself produce this effect; and this may show us the absolute necessity of divine influence to give the gospel its saving and sanctifying effects upon the minds of men.

I am apprehensive, my dear friend, that you will consider me as having *sermonized* too much on this subject; and, in truth, I plead guilty to the charge. I have only to request that you will summon up all your candor, and make what excuses you can for me. I feel anxious that there should exist no misunderstanding between us on this fundamental point; for unless we be agreed here, we cannot be agreed respecting the character of God, in which case our correspondence will be to little purpose. I wish you to know how this doctrine is understood and maintained among the Scotch Baptist Churches in

Digitized by Google

this country, and the stress we lay upon it. You know that Cudworth, the friend and correspondent of Hervey, wholly denied the necessity of this divine teaching, in order to give the word of God its proper or saving effect, contending that the word is *the* Spirit! and after him Mr. Robert Little, who left this country for the United States about 25 years ago, adopted Cudworth's hypothesis, and propagated it here to the subverting of many from the faith once delivered to the saints. Most of Mr. Little's disciples have, in process of time, verged into Socinianism or Deism, among whom were some of the elders of our churches; and I mention these things solely for the purpose of accounting to you for my tenaciousness on this point of doctrine. I had a little public controversy with R. L. on these matters before he took his departure, but I fear it did not end in convincing him of the unscriptural nature of his sentiments.

Adieu, my beloved friend! May Heaven guide, protect, and prosper you in all your ways!

I remain yours faithfully,

WILLIAM JONES.

Mr. Meredith---again.

"MR. CAMPBELL ONCE MORE.

"OUR old friend, Mr. Campbell of Virginia, after a quiet nap of six months, has waked up all at once in a terrible *bluster*. As Major Downing would say, "The man appears to be quite *wrathy*." He foams and flounces like a wild bull in a net.—And all for what—pray? Why, forsooth, because we refused to accede to a proposition of *his*, which he passed off with his readers for *ours;* because we wrote more than he did; because we transferred part of a statement from the Interpreter with the usual signs of quotation; because we expressed our own sense of his words in our own language; and because we insisted that he should either stand up to the defence of his Extras, or quit the field. If we are fairly accused of more than this, we have yet to learn what it is. That our readers may enjoy the full benefit of this rare piece of composition, we present them with the whole article, *verbatim et literatim*."

[For the article referred to, see Millennial Harbinger, No. 7, vol. 6.]

"The first charge entered against us is, that we have failed to comply with our engagement; that we have forfeited our word and our honor; and that, as Mr. Campbell most poetically expresses it, 'our full moon face is how gibbous, and fast waning into the last quarter.' For the sake of all whom it may concern, we will here simply recapitulate our statements. They are briefly these: In consequence of a complaint, or charge, or some such thing, first urged by Mr. Campbell, because we had not consented to open our columns to his defence of a given proposition, we made the following announcement in the Interpreter of September last: 'If Mr. Campbell conscientiously believes that justice to himself, and the interests of his cause, require that he should be heard in the Interpreter, he shall be gratified. On this subject we have but one fear—that of devoting too much of our paper to useless debate. Be it known, then, that touching the proposition referred to by our call, [the first and principal proposition considered in the Examination] Mr. C. shall have line for line and page for page with us in our columns.' In the Recorder of 7th January last we add the following: 'We would remind our friend of the Harbinger, however, that we shall continue to hold ourselves in readiness to fulfil our promise whenever it shall suit his convenience. And as we are no longer limited to our little monthly Interpreter, we shall not object to having our promise construed on pretty liberal principles.' In the Recorder of 18th February, we continue as follows:—'When the question touching this proposition [the same as above] shall be settled, it will be time enough to make arrangements for future operations. Our present impression is, that, provided Mr. Campbell shall comply with our terms respecting his first proposition, we shall consider ourselves at liberty to grant him similar terms concerning a second, a third, and so on to the end of the chapter.' And in the Recorder of 10th June we add the following:—'For the sake of taking away every possible ground of complaint, should any such exist, we will go so far as to say that *we will publish whatever Mr. C. will write in defence of the Extras*, and he may choose his own order, and his own mode of discussion.' Besides this, we have published every article which Mr. Campbell has written touching this controversy, while for us he has published not a single one. With these statements and these facts before him, the reader is left to decide for himself, with what kind of justice, and with how much truth, Mr. Campbell has assured his readers that we have receded from our position, or that our full moon face is *less full* now than it was at the beginning.

Digitized by Google

"In view of the above we have two remarks to make, to which the reader can give such attention as he may think proper. They are these:—

"When Mr. Campbell informed his readers that we had engaged to republish his replies, in the *general* and *unqualified* manner stated by him in his *January number*, he told them that which he certainly knew to be untrue. Our words were before him, '*Touching the proposition referred to by our call*—'*more than this we promise not.*' This was not an *interpretation*, as Mr. Campbell falsely tells his readers. It was the *original statement*, and the *only* statement we had then made on the subject. These words are, as they were intended to be, plain, precise, and unequivocal. He who misunderstands such language as this, must do it because he wishes and designs to do it. And he who can misrepresent a statement as much as Mr. Campbell has misrepresented this, ought to be the last man in the world to complain of being misrepresented.

"This misrepresentation was made for the manifest purpose of fabricating a charge against us, and of thereby creating a pretext for evading a defence of the Extras. We say this because there is no other way of accounting for the fact, and because the event has shown it to be correct. A man deeply solicitous for the truth, and confident of ability to defend what he had written, instead of quibbling, and cavilling, and quarrelling about preliminaries, would have gone directly to work, would have shown where his propositions and his arguments had been misrepresented—if such had been the fact—and would then have appealed to the justice of his adversary for the republication of his defence.

"The second charge on record—that we published more for ourselves than we did for Mr. Campbell, when, at the same time, we published for him all that he had written, is too silly to need a serious reply. There is, however, one remark which we would here make in passing. It is this: That part of our article which Mr. Campbell has refused to publish, was by far the most important part. It was designed to show—and did unanswerably show—that he had twice misrepresented us. And this, no doubt, constituted the reason why it was rejected. That it had any immediate connexion with the *argument*—with the defence of the Extras—was not pretended. It is certain, however, that it had fully as much to do with the 'argument' as any thing which Mr. Campbell has written, either before or since.

"In regard to the third charge—the misquotation, over which the reverend gentleman raves and rages so vehemently, we have two brief remarks to make:—

"Mr. Campbell has in the heat of his passion unwittingly stated what was precisely the fact, namely, that the quotation in question, instead of being from *him*, was from the *Interpreter*. His words are not to be mistaken—'that he has once, in a former number, italicised a proposition for me, *and here quoted a part of it.*' &c. From this it is plain that the author knew, at the moment at which he was charging us with forgery, that the accusation was totally unfounded. Indeed, no one who has paid any attention to the Examination, and to the controversy since, would understand that we meant to say, by the above quotation, that such were the precise words of Mr. Campbell: the whole connexion proves the contrary.

"But had the said quotation been designed and understood as the words of Mr. Campbell, there would have been substantially neither error nor misrepresentation in the case. He asserts with his usual show of sincerity, that he 'never affirmed such a proposition in word or in writing.' But let us see his words. They are these: 'When these facts [the facts of the scriptures,] are understood, or brought into immediate contact with the mind of man, as a moral seal or archetype, they delineate the image of God upon the human soul.' See Extra, No. 6, p. 341. Let this be compared with the words of the quotation: '*That the facts of the Scriptures do delineate the image of God upon the soul.*' Remark here is unnecessary.

"The fourth accusation is, that we made and italicised a proposition for Mr. Campbell, by which we greatly misrepresented and injured him. In support of this charge the author quotes some of his own language, and then appeals to his readers for a sentence of condemnation against us. For the curiosity of the thing we will first present the reader with Mr. Campbell's words, and then with our own, as they stand on record in the first number of our Examination:—

" 'When these facts are understood, or brought into immediate contact with the mind of man, as a moral seal or archetype, they delineate the image of God upon the human soul. All the means of grace are, therefore, only the means of impressing this seal upon the heart; of bringing these moral facts to make their full impression on the soul of man.' **** 'These moral facts unfold all the moral grandeur of Jehovah, and make Jesus the effulgence of his glory, the express image of his substance. These are the moral seal, which testimony conveys to the understanding, and faith brings to the heart of sinners, by which God creates them anew and forms them for his glory.' See Extra No. 6, p. 341: also, Interpreter, vol. 2, p. 20.

"Our language is as follows: 'We have quoted thus largely and particularly, that the full and precise meaning of the author might be exhibited. In these quotations taken together, the following proposition is clearly and fully laid down, namely, *that the system of facts as announced in the gospel, when apprehended by the natural mind, do, of themselves, delineate the image of God upon the human soul; and that it is by the operation of these facts, thus acting on the understanding and the heart, that sinners are created anew and formed for the glory of God.* In other words, that the word and the testimony constitute the only direct agency that is employed in the production of faith, repentance, reformation, and every other part of the process by which the sinner is made a new creature.' See Interpreter, vol. 2, page 20.

"Such are the words of Mr. Campbell as stated by himself, and such is the representation of those words as made by us. The reader is now left to determine for himself—how far it is true that we made a proposition for Mr. Campbell of any kind—how far it is true that we have in any degree misrepresented the import of his language—and how far he himself has done the CLEAN THING, by keeping back, in his last number, by far the most material part of his own words.

"It is not a little amusing that, full twelve months after this proposition had been made, and italicised, and passed off to our readers as Mr. Campbell's, agreeably to the charge above stated, this same Mr. Campbell should tell his readers that 'Mr. Meredith is one of the most *respectable* and *honorable* of the Baptist Ministers in the South;' and that 'he has written fourteen numbers on these two Extras, and has displayed a good deal of sound sense, critical acumen,

Digitized by Google

polemic tact, considerable reading in popular theology, and more knowledge of the Bible than is common among Baptist preachers.' See Millennial Harbinger, vol. 6, page 31. Which of these two statements is the true one—that which accuses us of FORGERY, or that which pronounces us the most HONORABLE—the editor has not yet informed us.

"We would add here that we have at no time, insisted on the accuracy of the above version. Nor have we ever denied to Mr. Campbell the privilege of explanation and correction. On the contrary, we have said repeatedly that if we had, in any instance, misstated his words or his meaning, we should be pleased to be put right. In the present case, had he shown us that we had misunderstood him, corrected our error, and given us his precise meaning, he would have received our prompt and respectful attention. The facts—that he has not done this—that he has angrily accused us of misrepresentation, without an attempt to inform us what his meaning is; and more especially that he has sought to disguise and evade the truth by misrepresenting his own language, confirms us in the belief that our version is correct, and that he knows it to be such.

"The fourth charge—that we have refused to discuss this, that, and the other thing, rather than the original and proper subject of debate, is too shallow and frivolous to be urged by a well taught school-boy. Mr. Campbell knows as well as we do, that the only rational and consistent subject of discussion which can claim our attention—and that too which was proposed and undertaken by himself—is the *defence of his Extras*. This, then, is that which he must discuss—or none at all. He can fret, and foam, and rave, and rage, if he thinks that by so doing he can help his cause or keep up his courage; but as to ourselves, we have taken one position and are not to be moved. Flattery and abuse will be found equally unavailing.

"So much for the accusations. We shall now notice a few minor topics, and then close the concern:—

"It is diverting to see how many shifts and turns the author adopts in order to escape the one thing needful and necessary—the defence of the Extras. In the first place he can do nothing unless he can be allowed to figure in our columns. This being granted, he then commences an attack on *our* theory as he calls our sentiments, with a view of getting up a controversy on that. Having failed there, he now proposes a new proposition, with a view, as we suppose, of taking a fresh start, in the hope, as it would seem, that he will fare better in a new effort. Any thing, every thing, or nothing, rather than stand up to the mark and defend what he has written.

"But suppose we should agree to take up this new proposition, and launch out into a new field of controversy, how should we proceed? We are not to interpret the author's words; we are not to express our sense of his meaning in our own language—if we do, we shall be liable to the charge of unfairness, misrepresentation, and forgery. How then shall we know whether we understand his meaning? how shall our readers understand us? or how shall we make our argument intelligible to any one? This would indeed be a splendid method of conducting a controversy! Whether this is the effect of downright ignorance, or whether it is only a contrivance to get clear of a close and decisive onset, we leave to the decision of those better acquainted with the author than ourselves.

"The 'high-minded terms' spoken of by Mr. Campbell, and the *high-minded expressions too*, such as *'forgery,' 'forging,' 'counterfeit,' 'how much he owes to my mercy,' 'theory blown to atoms,' 'ashamed of your course,'* &c. &c. require no other notice than the simple remark, that they bespeak a weak mind, a vulgar taste, a scarcity of argument, and the irritation of mortification and defeat. They can use them who relish them, and have need of them.

"Mr. Campbell's professions in relation to honorable and gentlemanly treatment come now entirely too late. In view of his conduct and his language, such professions with us weigh not a feather. We have taken the dimensions of his honor, his justice, and his veracity, from data furnished by himself, and we know precisely what they are worth. An editor who will charge another with a misdemeanor, and then, after the charge has been refuted, will neither make an apology nor publish the refutation, is neither a gentleman nor an honest man. From Mr. Campbell, therefore, we now expect nothing—and ask nothing. From this time forward, he can either publish our replies or he can let it alone—as may best suit his purpose.

"That Mr. Campbell may now distinctly understand how much we care for his *mercy* or his *wrath*, we hereby put it plainly and flatly to him—we challenge him to his face, if he is a man, to come out and defend his Extras. Our Examination is before him; our columns are open; all he has to do is to 'go ahead.' We regret the necessity which compels us to be so uncourteous, and especially towards a person so much our senior as is Mr. Campbell. There are, however, some men in relation to whom mild, and gentle, and courteous treatment will not answer; and Mr. Campbell has proved himself to belong to this class. We have therefore resolved to leave him but the single alternative of either defending his essays, or of admitting their indefensibility. He is at liberty, of course, to take his choice.

"Mr. Campbell seems to think that he has mistaken *his man;* and indeed we are much of the same opinion ourselves. We think, however, that all will agree with us, that if he does not understand us after this, the fault will not be ours.

"Our reason for writing so much on the present occasion is this: We deemed it expedient that our readers should see for themselves, on what kind of authority and with how much truth, Mr. Campbell is accustomed to bring charges. In future we shall consider it quite sufficient to meet his accusations by a verbal contradiction; believing that our bare *denial* will be more than enough to neutralize his *assertions*.——EDITOR REC."

I candidly confess that I am disappointed in the favorable opinion I had formed of Mr. *Meredith*. It was insinuated by those who know him better than I, that I would never get a fair hearing in his paper. I was unwilling to believe it. But his last essay confirms the presumption, and leaves me nothing to expect but to be abused out of his

Digitized by Google

columns. It would seem that he calculates largely upon his scurrility, and that he will soon have to announce to his readers my defeat; or, as he chooses to express it, that I abandoned "the defence of my Extras." The terms on which he offers me his columns are virtually such as no person who values his reputation would accept. For what man of sensibility would throw himself in the way of such foul aspersions and rude assaults as abound in the preceding pages? Already he talks of "terrible bluster"—of "foaming and flouncing like a wild bull in a net"—"neither a gentleman nor an honest man"—of "his angrily accusing us of misrepresentation"—of "disguising and evading the truth by misrepresenting his own language"—of "fretting, foaming, raving, raging," &c. &c. If this be the gentlemanly and christian style of Mr. Meredith, one might be curious to hear him personate the opposite character!

I have made two attempts to defend my Extras in his paper; one was by attacking the theory he opposes to them, a course hitherto sanctioned by the best precedents in existence; the other was by showing that he has made a proposition for me, or begins by attacking a proposition which I never uttered, and consequently all his labor on that head is lost.

It is generally admitted, except on the part of the Roman Inquisitions, that one accused of error shall have the right of defending himself in whatever way he chooses, either by directly sustaining his own views, or by showing the irrelevancy of the antagonist objections or the fallacy of the opposing theory. In the bloody reign of Mary I. recollect one exception: It was thought decent to afford Cranmer and his associates an opportunity of defending the Protestant doctrine before the Court; but the Queen's champions of orthodoxy would dictate how the worthy Prelate should defend his doctrine, and not only prescribed his theses and mode of defence, but employed persons to laugh and abuse him out of countenance. I need not add, that Cranmer's death was decreed by the Court before his defence was heard. The gentleman of the Recorder is therefore kept in countenance by one illustrious and royal example, and one of this sort is worth a thousand from the common walks of life. I must, therefore, as I have the misfortune to be on the weak side with the people of Carolina, submit to the dictation of Editor Meredith as to the mode of defending my Extras, on pain of excommunication from his orthodox columns; and would only beg the favor, that, while he allows me this honor, he will not put me upon the pillory, and invite his readers to bespatter me with filth. I only ask to be taken decently by the arm and shut out of his columns. He may talk of "the heat of my passion," and my "foaming" and "vulgar taste," and "a weak mind," to the people of North Carolina, with all impunity, after he has announced to them that I give up my Extras into his hand defenceless, while in truth I only wait for the guarantee of a full and fair audience, and permission to defend my Extras in my own way. Where we are read and known personally, we care as little for such abuse as does the Moon for the barking of a dog. Our character for all that is moral and

Digitized by Google

courteous is at the defiance of all the defamers in or out of favor with the people. But to come to the point at once, I will defend every position of my Extras against any man living, in their true and proper sense; and I will do it in Mr. Meredith's paper in my own way, or not at all.

I shall also do it with the understanding that when Mr. Meredith misrepresents my views, which he has *very generally done*, I shall call misrepresentation by its proper name; but I will not impugn his motives nor his character. I will not retaliate aught but truth for error, and fair and generous treatment for their contraries. I will not say he wilfully deceived his readers, or that, in brief, he "lied" when he told them in the preceding number that he published my short essay "*literatim et punctuatim*," when in truth he has done no such thing—but with sundry great errors affecting the sense. I do not say that he intended to do this; but I will say that he has done it, and therefore his assertion is not true.

I am not, then, Mr. Meredith, to be laughed or abused out of countenance: for the gospel's sake I have long learned "to bear evil treatment;" and as for being "wrathy," as you say, you have wholly mistaken and misrepresented me. But now I will tell you once for all, that if I am not allowed to defend my Extras by carrying the war into Carthage, if I please; or if I must defend them as you please, then be candid enough to inform me and your readers, and I will not disturb your repose.

As for your first two numbers, I have disposed of them already by showing that you have falsely represented my views, and made me affirm a proposition no where found in my writings. I say that *God, by the gospel facts, does delineate his image*, &c. You represent me as saying that *the facts themselves do delineate*, &c. Now you may gloss and varnish this new version seventy times seven times, to the entire satisfaction of your conscience and that of your readers, but you will never get a sensible and honest man to say that you have not *forged!* Too strong a term? Say *fabricated!* Is that offensive? Then say *invented* or *manufactured* a proposition for me. I do believe and have clearly taught, time after time, that the Spirit of God is the regenerator, and that he does it only by his word; and while I cordially reprobate your theory, or rather that of Andrew Fuller, about his previous holy principle and his regenerated unbeliever, and all that philosophy, I do teach that the Holy Spirit renovates the human mind by the instrumentality of his word; while you and many others seem to me to contend that the Holy Spirit personally descends from heaven, enters the human heart, and, without his word, miraculously creates a man anew. In supporting your theory, you, in my judgment, misapply every text you quote from old Testament or New, as much as in your judgment do the Paidobaptists in proving their infant sprinkling. In my judgment there is not one grain of difference between you and them in the liberty you take with the sacred text.

God did not create light but through his word, and he has never enlightened any son of Adam but by his word. You say he has; and

Digitized by Google

cannot bring a single instance from the birth of time till now. I can bring a thousand instances of his enlightening, renewing, and sanctifying men through his word, or by his communications. You cannot adduce a solitary instance of man, woman, or child having been renewed but by truth spoken or heard. But I pretend not to separate the Word and the Spirit of God. I do not say the word alone nor the Spirit alone enlightens, sanctifies, or saves. With the Lord Jesus I would pray to the Father, "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is the truth." I would not say with you, 'Sanctify them by thy Spirit' alone.

These things I say to your readers; and I would beseech them by all that is sacred and eternal in the gospel, not to allow you to bias their minds or to judge for them. I give all that you have written on this subject to my readers; and I say to them, Read, examine, and decide for yourselves: I will not be responsible for you. You must be judged for yourselves. I wish the readers of every religious periodical to have the same opportunity. I consent to fill several pages with matter which I judge to be no more edifying, and not more courteous than the ebullitions of political demagogues, purely as the *purchase* for a hearing of both sides, and as an example of that fair and candid and magnanimous way of defending truth, which I would wish to see universally prevalent.

To proceed with my defence of the Extras, I will take up the third number next month, having disposed of the two first, which are directed against a proposition which I have never published. There is one remark in these two numbers which I must emphatically notice for the sake of disabusing Mr. Meredith's readers. Mr. M. objects to the phrase "*process of regeneration*," because with him there is no process: a person is regenerate and born again without any means whatever, as I understand him—by a single act of God's Spirit. Of course, then, the word *regeneration* misleads us; for if there be no analogy between *generation* and *regeneration*, then the term was most unfortunate and unhappy. And need I show that generation is a process—that God, in the generation of the universe, did not form a creature but by a process, or by means? For, with me, means and process are in this usage the same. If means be used in producing any result, then is that operation a process. To deny that regeneration is a process, is only to say that it is without means. Is this the doctrine of Mr. Meredith? If so, it will be a herculean task for him to explain the necessity of preaching the gospel. I will ask the pardon of all my readers for the dry morsels which they have had from the columns of the "*Recorder*," and my notices of them, which have only been preparatory to a more clear and ample expose of the modern gospels. I will say to them, that nothing but the argumentative parts of Mr. Meredith's essays shall hereafter be replied to, should he not shut me out of his columns. All the fine drapery of his graceful style and good manners shall pass without remark.

EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

Everlasting Punishment.

Respected Sir,

YOU will not suspect me of insincerity or flattery when I assure you, that I know of no person in whose literary and biblical attainments I have a higher opinion than in yours. Hence the propriety of my selecting you as one at whose hand to solicit help in some matters of importance, about which I have some difficulties. As I have some leisure from secular engagements, I have concluded that I could not do better than to employ those moments in disclosing to you those difficulties, a solution of which would be of importance to many of the community as well as to myself.

I begin with the Greek word *gehenna*. Dr. Adam Clark says that *gehenna* is a compound of two Greek words, *ghe* and *hinnom*, and means the Valley of Hinnom, south-east of Jerusalem. Mr. Willam tells us about the same words, and further observes that in this valley was kept a continual fire, from the days of Josiah king of Israel, to consume dead bodies and unclean things. From the name of this valley originated the word *gehenna*, which is translated *hell*.

No. 21st of the Appendix to the new translation of the Living Oracles, says *gehenna* is compounded of *Ge* and *Hinnom*, the name of a person.

It does not appear from all the data before me, that the term *gehenna* was ever used by the Jews to express future punishment, even down to the days of Josephus. Hence it would seem, that as the Scriptures were all written prior to the days of Josephus, the word *gehenna* was never used by our Saviour nor his Apostles to express future punishment; but was used by them in reference to the Valley of Hinnom, near Jerusalem. So the phrase *hell fire* means the fire of Hinnom, in which the filth of the city was consumed, and where criminals were sometimes burned to death.

Thus it seems that *hell fire* and *damnation of hell* simply mean temporal judgments executed in the Valley of Hinnom; and so we get a clue to the phrase *unquenchable fire*. This figure of expression would be very readily drawn from the circumstance of that *fire of gehenna*, being continually burning in the Valley of Hinnom, to consume the filth, and keep offenders in awe. The fire of *gehenna* was a place of capital punishment among the Jews, and calculated to terrify the mind; it was, therefore, a natural figurative usage, to express any severe judgment inflicted in this life. Thus Jeremiah calls it a *fire that shall not be quenched*, chap. vii. 20. See also chap. xvii. 27. Isaiah, chap. i. 31. and xxxiv. 8, 9, 10, 11. Temporal judgments are alluded to in the foregoing quotations; are they not?

Now, my dear sir, if these things be so, how can we prove or rationally imbibe and sustain the doctrine that there is an eternal punishment for sinners beyond this life? Shall we say the Saviour, in speaking of *gehenna*, used it as an emblem of *hell?* Doctors Clark and Campbell tell us that the Jews made the Valley of Hinnom an emblem of a place of punishment after death. But when did the

Digitized by Google

Jews make this emblematic use of *gehenna*? Long after the days of our Saviour, and then they made it an emblem of the Pagan hell, the notion of which they borrowed from the Chaldeans.

Hell, says Dr. Adam Clark, is derived from the Anglo-Saxon *helon*, which, in the Saxon language, signifies to *cover* or *conceal*. Hence the slating or tiling of a house in Cornwall, and the covering of a book in Lancashire, are called *helling*. "The term *hell*," says the Doctor, "is now used to signify *the place of the damned;* but the word in the original has no such ideas attached to it." And although the Doctor opines that our Lord used the term *gehenna* as an emblem of the place of future punishment, yet *he* does not venture to use it himself in that way, but simply calls it "*the place of the damned spirits.*" [Notes on Matt. xxv. 26.]

Now does it not appear that mankind have been shamefully hoodwinked by the priesthood in these matters? Have we not repeatedly had our ears stunned with the declamations of *hell fire* and *brimstone*, and when the truth comes out they all admit that the Valley of Hinnom, a place near Jerusalem, is alluded to by our Lord in those expressions. Some of the Jews imbibed the Pagan idea of future punishment of the wicked; and after the destruction of their city and temple, having seen so many dead carcases consumed in the Valley of Hinnom, they held the place in such utter abhorrence they made it an *emblem of the infernal regions of Pluto*. And after the heathen became too enlightened to give further credence to such notions, they were engrafted with the mild and merciful gospel of the compassionate Son of God.

Will it be admitted that the Jews borrowed their notion of a future punishment from the Chaldeans, while in captivity at Babylon? and is it not well known that they also borrowed the term by which those Pagans spoke of their place of punishment in their world of ghosts? Every Jewish writer, from the time they imbibed their notion of future punishment, spoke of the place by the term *hades*, until long after the days of our Saviour. Josephus speaks of it by this term, and I know of no Jewish writer, from the Babylonish captivity to Josephus, that speaks of these ghostly regions by any other name than that of *hades*. *Hades* is a compound of *a*, negative, and *idien*, to see; and literally means *hidden*, *invisible*, or *obscure*. *Hades* expresses the state of dislodgment of the soul from the body, but does not express the nature of that state only as it regards its obscurity. It may be a state of happiness or misery.

Orthodox critics say the outward and primary meaning of *gehenna* is the Valley of Hinnom, and was used by the Jews as an emblem of a future state of punishment. Before the name of one place can be used as an emblem of another, the place for which the emblem is used must be known to exist. Now I simply ask, By what name was this place of punishment (if there was one) known before *gehenna* was used to express an idea of it? Our critics will not admit that either the Hebrew *sheol* or the Greek *hades* is a proper name by which this nameless place can be rightly expressed. It appears this "*place* of

Digitized by Google

damned spirits" never had a name until long after the days of our Saviour, when some pious Jews thought proper to act as godfather to this *place of damned spirits*, and consecrate it to the valley in which his forefathers executed criminals—and thus furnish christians with a *hell* for sinners. If the doctrine of a place of future punishment be a truth of revelation, is it not reasonable to suppose that some term of definite import, by which this place of damned spirits might be expressed, without borrowing the name of a valley in Judea, through the aid of Jewish chimera and superstition, would have been employed?

Now, sir, if the Scriptures, both Jewish and Christian, can furnish evidence to prove a punishment for sinners after death, do let me have it; and if such punishment is established, then I want to know the nature of such punishment in point of duration.

Aion and *aionios* are the Greek terms which are in the New Testament translated *everlasting* and *eternal*. *Aion* occurs 117 times in the Greek version of the Scriptures, and is variously rendered. It occurs in the adjective form 69 times; also, differently translated. See 2d Balfour, page 251.

The corresponding word in Hebrew to these two Greek terms is *olem;* and in Latin it is *avum*. "The Hebrew *olem* and the Greek *aion* are both used to express a limited time; but, in general, a time, the limits of which is unknown." So says Dr. Clark. "The Greek *aion* denotes time finite or infinite."—*Ewing*.

"*Aion* is a compound of two words, *ai* and *on, always being*. It denotes duration or continuation of time, but with great variety." This definition is given by Parkhurst. And on the Hebrew *olem* he says, "It seems to be much more frequently used for an indefinite than for an infinite time." In his Greek Lexicon, on the words *aion* and *aionios*, he says, "The Hebrew *olem* answers as the corresponding word for these two words in the Greek of the Seventy; which words," says he, "denote time hidden from man, whether definite or indefinite." "The words *kedesh* and *oa*, rendered by Turretine *eternity*, are like the Greek *aion*, that also signifies any thing ancient, which has endured, or is to endure for a long period."—*Professor Stewart*.

This is the substance of what all learned critics say with respect to the use of the Hebrew and Greek words which are translated *eternal*, &c. *Olem* is the original word from which the two Greek words in question are rendered. Hence it is, as seems to me, by the use of that word that we are to determine the sense—the true scriptural sense of *everlasting*, *eternal*, &c.

Olem, in Hebrew, signifies any thing old or ancient. Hence we read of the old (*olem*) way, the *olem* land marks, the *olem* times, &c. Circumcision is called the *olem* covenant—that is, the *everlasting;* the priesthood of Aaron is called an *olem* priesthood. All these, and many other *everlastings*, are translated from the Hebrew *olem*, and have had their beginnings and endings, and in this mode of existence, and in no one case are they to be understood as relating to *eternity*.

Macknight and Wakefield both agree that *aion* and *avum* are used to express a limited time. For instance, the age of a man, or that of a child, if it should die at one day old. The word is used among the Greeks in a relative sense—it means a longer or a shorter period, according to the nature of the thing to which it is applied—as we use the phrase *a long time.* When we speak of a man who lives to be very old, we say he lived *a long time;* if we speak of one who died at 20, we say he lived *a short time.* If a person should lie sick eight weeks, we would say he was sick *a long time;* but if one were to go Jerusalem and return in *six months*, we would say he was gone but *a short time.* If one had to hold his finger in the fire but for one minute, he would say it was *a long time.* In this sense it seems the Hebrew *olem*, the Greek *aion*, the Latin *avum*, and the English *everlasting* are used. When the Hebrews or Greeks spoke of a man's life time, they called it *olem* or *aion*—forever, everlasting, always being.

Now, sir, I cannot avoid three conclusions as the result of all research which I am able to make in these matters; which I will name. The first is this: If *gehenna* means the Valley of Hinnom, near Jerusalem, then the Scriptures do not teach a punishment beyond the Jordan of death. 2d. If a future punishment should be proved, we have no knowledge in reference to the time of its duration; for there is no certainty whether *olem* or *aionios* punishment is one minute or a thousand years, or just a person's life time. 3d. If *olem* or *aionios* punishment belongs exclusively and is confined to this life, how can we get *aionios zoe* (eternal life) to extend its boundaries over or beyond the narrow limits of the present existence? A hint to the wise is sufficient. In carefully examining this communication, you will, I think, readily apprehend my difficulties—a solution of which will confer a favor on several of the Lord's disciples, as well as your servant.

Your affectionate friend—and, forsooth, your brother in the Lord,
SPENCER.

Answer to Mr. Spencer.

My dear Sir,

IN all that appertains to religion, the first thing with me is, *What say the Scriptures?* The previous question undoubtedly is, Is the Book of the Law, and is the Book of the Gospel of divine authority? This question being decided, (and with me it has been long since most certainly decided in the affirmative,) what remains is to regard all its developments of the vast unseen and unbounded future as fixed and certain principles, no more to be doubted than the axiomata of the most exact and demonstrative sciences. Faith, then, and not reason alone, is the rule of thought, of feeling, and of action.

Every thing in religion is supernatural. Its hopes and its fears are drawn from oracles superhuman and divine. No natural man, by all his senses and perceptions, by all his reflections and reasonings, unaided by the lamp of eternity, could arrive at the knowledge of immortality. Eternal life and eternal punishment, "everlasting

Digitized by Google

salvation" and "everlasting destruction" are not deductions of reason, are not inferences drawn from the data of material nature, but revelations from the sempiternal Author of human existence.

That the words of this message are to be fairly interpreted not by bye-laws and private canons, but by the universal and long since established laws in the dominions of language and mind, is also a principle as well ascertained as that God has spoken in human speech to mortal man. Through the imagery of nature, and the costume of society, ideas of things divine, spiritual and eternal, are conveyed by the Spirit of wisdom and revelation into the mind of man: therefore, that imagery and those variant costumes of society must be understood as the stipulated signs of thought antecedent to a clear and full apprehension of the things revealed.

We have long since unanimously agreed that things figuratively represented are to be understood in accordance with such representations; and that the unfigurative delineations of things are ever to be the landmarks of thought and inquiry by which the interpretations of metaphor, parable, and allegory are to be authoritatively decided. I say, unanimously; for all the educated of all parties and of all creeds have been compelled to this conclusion. Hence, when without figure, and with all the clearness and authority of supreme law, it is promulged by the Christian Lawgiver, "He that shall believe and shall have been immersed shall be saved; and he that will not believe shall be damned, or condemned"—no allusion to ancient customs—no figurative representations through the imagery of nature, or costume of society, can have authority to make it read or mean, 'He that shall believe, and shall have been immersed, shall be saved; and he that will not believe shall also be saved.' *Saved* and *condemned* are opposites, and no reasoning upon any figure, custom, or form of speech, can make them identical. If *saved* is temporal, so is *condemned*; if *saved* is spiritual, so is *condemned;* if *saved* is corporeal, so is *condemned:* but *saved* and *condemned* are two states, fates, or fortunes, that are perfect contrasts. Life and death, good and evil, happiness and misery, yes and no, will as readily and as rationally mean one and the same thing, as *saved* and *damned.* These are by the Judge of all, by the Judge of the Supreme Court of Heaven, declared to be the fate inexorable of two classes of mankind. Belief and unbelief are not the same; neither is salvation and condemnation the same thing—they form not the same character, and cannot issue in the same state—it is impossible. Therefore, reasonings upon *gehenna*, and theory based on figure, or on the supposed nature and perfections of the Deity, must stand avaunt when they issue in results that falsify the promulgations of Heaven's own Lawgiver and man's Redeemer.

All that you, my dear sir, say about *gehenna*, and more than you have said, may be admitted, (and indeed I have said more on the abuse of this term and its correlates than you have said, in the way of definition and illustration; and sometimes in the way of censure on those "hell-fire preachers," who seem to be guided more by apocalyp-

Digitized by Google

tic vision and figurative representations, known only in Judea, but no where found in the teachings of the Apostle to the Gentiles, than by the style of the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles;) and yet eternal life and eternal death remain the immutable and invincible sanctions of God's last message to mankind; and yet your inferences and conclusions must be cordially and unequivocally repudiated by all the believers of Christ's gospel. I say, in one short sentence, your remarks on *gehenna* and its correlates may be admitted as indisputable; and yet your inferences, or your seeming inferences, are essentially illogical and unscriptural —and, as such, must be repudiated.

The same concessions I would extend to your quotations and remarks on *hades*, on *olem*, and *aion*, and with all these criticisms and reasonings before me, I must reject your inferences as wholly at fault in the presence of all the oracles of reason, the decisions of logic, and the plain and unfigurative declarations of the Apostles. I might, perhaps, make some exceptions to the extent and applications of your criticisms, and to the style of your reasonings upon these words; but to save time and labor (with me always a desideratum) I will concede the whole, and show that your inferences are necessarily and unavoidably to be rejected by every man who believes the Apostles' doctrine:—

1st. Because your reasonings, by one fatal sweep, destroy the eternity of God and the immortality of man; for if the words olem, aio nion, aevum, [your *avum* is not Latin,] everlasting, eternal, applied to the destruction of the wicked, mean not duration without end—then have we no words in human speech that certify us that God, angels, or saints shall have duration without end. One of the oracles of reason and one of the decisions of logic say, that what proves too much proves nothing. Your reasonings, then, prove too much for you as well as for me. Therefore, you must reconsider the matter, if you please. There is no word in human language that expresses duration without end, which is not applied to the future punishment of the wicked. Because these words are sometimes taken only in part of their signification, is it good logic to say that they are never used in their full meaning! Or can you, with any reason or consistency, affirm that they are taken in their full signification when applied to future bliss, and only in a part of their signification when applied to future misery!

2d. You say, "If *gehenna* means the Valley of Hinnom, near Jerusalem, then the Scriptures do not teach punishment beyond the Jordan of death." Your conclusion is not in your premises. To make it logical it must read thus: 'If *gehenna* means the Valley of Hinnom, near Jerusalem, and if this word *gehenna* include all that the Scriptures say of future punishment, then the Scriptures do not teach any other punishment for sin than the Valley of Hinnom.'

3d. You add, that there is no certainty whether *olem* or *aionios* punishment mean one minute or a thousand years; and so of eternal life and the eternal God. But, my good sir, there are not minutes,

Digitized by Google

hours, nor years after death, and all such reasonings are without definite terms, and therefore wholly fallacious. But if God be eternal, then are life and death, happiness and misery eternal realities.

Let me now say in conclusion of my present reply to all your inferences, that they are subversive of the most plain and express sayings of Jesus and the Apostles; for all their teachings tend to the conclusion that it shall not be hereafter with the wicked as with the righteous; whereas you have no fears for the wicked, nor hope for the righteous—you have no eternal life and no everlasting destruction in your system; for the one makes the other necessary. And instead of everlasting life and an "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power" at his appearing and his kingdom, you have not one minute of bliss to propose to the good, nor a second of woe for the greatest transgressor of the laws of Heaven. Now can it require more than a bird's eye glance at your philosophy, to assure the candid reader of the New Testament that it is clearly subversive of all the hopes and fears which the Lord and his Apostles promulged to the world, and makes the gospel a dead letter? Be assured, my dear sir, that he is no friend of Jesus who preaches that he who believeth not shall be saved; or who infers that the righteous and the wicked shall after death be equally pure, holy, and happy for one moment or for duration without end.

Your friend, THE EDITOR.

The Methodist Discipline, on Baptism.

IN all that this Discipline says about christian *baptism*, it no where teaches, as I can ascertain, that the subject has received the remission of his sins before he is baptized. It cannot be implied by, or inferred from, any thing asserted there; nor is forgiveness spoken of any where as a necessary prerequisite. On the contrary, baptism seems to be pointed out as the medium through which the penitent is to receive pardon, and to be regenerated or born again! Let us examine and see. In the "ministration of baptism to such as are of riper years," the "minister" is to say in one of the forms of prayer, "We call upon thee for these persons, that they *coming* to thy holy *baptism may have remission of their sins*, by spiritual regeneration." [New York edition, 1832, page 105--6.] Does not this plainly and unequivocally imply that they had received the remission of their sins *before?* If not, what can it mean? and what does this "MAY" imply? If this extract be suffered to mean what it says and say what it means, does it not assert "baptism for remission of sins," and nullify every opposite tenet? And how well does this accord with "repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins!" Acts ii. 38. Again—the minister is to say in another form of prayer, "Give thy Holy Spirit to these persons that *they* MAY *be born again*, and BE *made heirs* of everlasting salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ." [page 107.] Does this imply that they have been re-

Digitized by Google

generated and made heirs *before?* Else, why this "MAY" here? and why this "BE" too? And if they have not been regenerated *previously*, when are they to be born again, if not when they are baptized? And it is worthy of notice, that this prayer is to be said just immediately before they are baptized, as a part of the ceremony to be used. How well does this accord with, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." [John iii. 5.] "He *saved* us by the washing [or bath] of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." [Titus iii. 5.] "He that believes and is *baptized* shall be *saved*." [Matth. xvi. 16.] "The like figure [of the *salvation* of Noah and his family in the Ark] whereunto even *baptism* does also now *save* us." [1 Peter iii. 21.] And again—the minister is to say to those to be baptized, "Well beloved, who are come hither, desiring *to receive* holy baptism, ye have heard how the congregation hath prayed that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe to receive you and bless you, *to* RELEASE *you from your* SINS, to give you the kingdom of heaven and everlasting life; and our Lord Jesus Christ hath *promised* in his *holy word* to GRANT *all those things* which we have *prayed* for: which *promise* he for his part will most surely *keep* and *perform*." [page 108.] This completely establishes and confirms what I have before quoted. Does not this place, "to *release* you of your *sins*," most positively and unequivocally imply that they were not released from them *previously?* And if not *released* from them, could they have had them *pardoned!* And according to the plain meaning of the first part of this quotation, this releasing is to take place when they "receive holy baptism"! The last part of this extract shows that I am not mistaken in my understanding of the meaning of these quotations which I have made.

Now, do our Methodist friends really believe *all* that their Discipline teaches? If they do, why do they write and preach so much against "baptism for the remission of sins"?* Where have we ever made stronger or more explicit assertions and intimations about the design of baptism, than they have here done? Do they preach and practise what is here taught? If not, (and this they do not) why retain it in their Discipline and standard work of faith and practice? They are *inconsistent* here; and equally inconsistent when they would have us to abandon this important point of christian doctrine, and subscribe to their Discipline where it is so plainly and explicitly taught!! Admitting that we are in error here, what would we gain by such a transfer as this?! It would be forsaking an error to embrace the very same!!! Let us never abandon one single point or

* I read in a little "Book on Baptism," from the pen of a "Methodist *Divine*," where this scriptural doctrine of "baptism for remission of sins" was termed "an old backneyed *heresy* of the Romish church!" This gentleman, then, acknowledges a Discipline for his rule of *faith* and practice, in which this 'heresy' is plainly taught!! And John Wesley was a Roman *heretic*, when he said in his note on Acts xxii. 16. "Baptism, administered to real penitents, is both a MEANS and *seal* of PARDON; nor did God ordinarily in the *primitive* church bestow this on any, unless through this means."

Digitized by Google

tenet for which we have a "thus saith the Lord;" but resolutely and perseveringly defend them to the last!

J. R. H.

OAK GROVE, *near Paris, Tenn.* July 31st, 1835.

The Sects, the Word, and the Spirit.

ALMOST every sect or denomination in christendom contend, as far as my knowledge extends, for some mystical, physical, undefinable, naked operation of the Spirit of God upon the heart of the sinner, in converting and making him a christian. There may be some, or there may be individuals among them, who do not contend for this kind of an operation, but for a rational and scriptural one, through the testimony or words of the Spirit. Why do they contend for a doctrine so much at variance with the revelations of God, and the understanding of man, to whom these revelations are addressed? The reason is very obvious: Their systems *cannot be sustained* by the WORD of God; and they are compelled to resort to another operation than that taught there, in order to uphold and support them! Would they admit the *efficiency* and *sufficiency* of the WORD, they would then take that Word *alone* for their "rule of faith and practice," and abandon their metaphysical operations and speculations. Those who do thus take that Word need no such operation as the above to hold up and sustain *their* system! It is founded upon, and sustained by that word, and therefore requires none of these extraneous aids and foreign supports! This is the reason why *they* contend for the power and sufficiency of this word; while others, having systems and doctrines to support which are not found there, contend for other or different aids of the Spirit, without which they must fall! This must be obvious to every really discriminating observer. The Spirit of God has declared (Eph. vi. 17.) that "the *sword* of the Spirit is the *word* of God." Heb. iv. 12. "The WORD of God is *quick* [or living] and *powerful*, and *sharper* than any two-edged sword, *piercing* even to the dividing asunder of *soul* and *spirit*, and of the *joints* and *marrow*, and is a *discerner* of the *thoughts* and *intents* of the HEART." Rom. 1. 16. "The GOSPEL of Christ is the *power* of God unto SALVATION to every one that *believes*. 1 Peter i. 5. "Kept by the *power* of God through FAITH unto *salavtion*, ready to be revealed in the last time." Rom. x. 17. "FAITH comes by *hearing*, and *hearing* by the WORD of God." With these and other similar testimonies before us, we may confidently, unhesitatingly, and safely affirm, that he who contends for an operation of the Spirit distinct or separate from the word, or that the word must be specially applied or accompanied by the Spirit; or that man is incapable of believing or receiving that word without some previous operation of the Spirit to enable him to believe or receive it, charges God either with a want of *veracity* in asserting that the Word or Gospel was the instrument of his Spirit's operation, when he operates

Digitized by Google

without it in another way; or with a defect in *wisdom*, in not furnishing man with sufficient testimony, or not strong enough to predicate his faith upon, and so needing a special application; or with a deficiency in *power*, in not forming man with a capacity of mind or understanding sufficient to apprehend and believe the facts and truths of revelation, without a previous operation and illumination!!!—"*Preach* the WORD," says Paul to Timothy, (2 Tim. iv. 2, 3.) "for the time will come [and it *has* come!] when they *will not endure* SOUND DOCTRINE; but after their *own lusts* shall they *heap up to themselves* TEACHERS, having *itching ears;* and they *shall turn away their ears from the* TRUTH, *and shall be turned unto* FABLES!

CLINOS.

Letter to William Jones---No. 7.

Beloved and venerable brother Jones,

IN reply to your letter, No. 4, found in a previous part of this number, I now devote a few pages. My correspondent *Paulinus*, from whom you have quoted some very judicious remarks, it is to be regretted; because of his attachment to Fullerism, as we term it, or, as he may prefer to express it, the sound doctrine of spiritual influence, has long since decided against the ancient order of things, and now opposes the reformation which we plead. Astonishing as it may seem to you, his name stands enrolled among the authors of the Dover Decrees, by which thousands have been cut off from communion with the "Regular Baptists," because they chose rather to obey God than men, and preferred the sacred style of the New Institution to that of John Calvin and Andrew Fuller.

On the subject of divine influence, or of the need of divine teaching in order to salvation, Mr. *Broaddus* and I always agreed. But in the manner of that teachiug we differed. However, as to that, it made no difference with me, so long as we agreed in the one faith, the one Lord, and the one immersion—the one body, the one Spirit, the one hope, and the one God and Father of all. I must be taught the elements of the christian religion in a school of which I have as yet heard nothing, before I can admit that the belief or adoption of any theory of conversion or of divine teaching is identical with believing and obeying the gospel. It is peculiarly unfortunate to the elicitation of truth, that any dogma should be held as too sacred for examination, or that our assent to a proposition should be so unreasonable as to forbid a reconsideration of the evidences on which that assent is grounded.

In our attempts to restore a pure speech, we have been so beset with favorite phrases and consecrated definitions, that our calling in question the scriptural authority of the scholastic style, has not unfrequently been identified with a disbelief or rejection of some of the cardinal matters of revelation and of popular christianity: for I re-

Digitized by Google

joice to know, and to express my conviction, that most of the cardinal items of the apostolic teachings are still capital and cardinal items in the most popular Protestant sects. But in order to a radical and permanent reformation or restoration of the primitive gospel and order of things, it behoved that the style and phraseology of scholastic divinity and quaint theology should undergo a thorough revision. This, indeed, was a most invidious task, and greatly drew down upon us the jealousy, and sometimes the anathemas of the orthodox and heretical sects of this prolific age. Because we would not say *Shibboleth* with an orthodox brogue, we have been every thing but followers of the apostolic christians. Many of those, however, that discarded us because we would call Bible things by Bible names, as Arian, Sabellian, Arminian, Calvinian, Universalian, or something else, have since repented of their premature decisions, and have had courage to confess their errors, and now to contend for the sacred style: there are, however, not a few who cannot humble themselves so far as to say, 'We were mistaken!' Out of this last class I am indeed sorry that I cannot except my friend Paulinus. I would not, however, refrain from saying, that perchance the too dogmatic style of some of our brethren reformers, and their too unqualified denunciations, may have compelled Mr. Broaddus and some others to take a course of which they are now truly penitent, but from which they have not practically reformed.

But to return to this difficulty: I doubt not but you do fully appreciate the value of a pure speech, and are satisfied that the gospel cannot run and be glorified till it be freed from the technicalities of a sectarian age. I am, therefore, not afraid that you will imagine that I deny the necessity of divine teaching, if I should inquire into the meaning of any of the phrases, alas! now too current among all christians, which I find in your very kind and excellent epistle of the 20th of May last.

Let me, then, with the most profound deference for your superior years and judgment, propose to your reconsideration the following phrases extracted from your letter now lying before me:—

1. "The New Covenant which was made with all the elect and ratified by the blood of Jesus." That God promised in the reign of his Son *to make* a new institution, or covenant, if you please, with all true believers, or "the elect of God, holy and beloved," is a scriptural phrase and doctrine. Is this the covenant that *was made* with all the elect *before Christ died*,—sometimes dated from all eternity; not then a *new* covenant, but the *oldest* and first of all covenants? You will understand me, and perceive my difficulty in understanding this style.

2. Is "divine teaching" distinguished from every man's teaching his neighbor, or only from the citizens of the kingdom of heaven teaching their fellow-citizens *to know the Lord*, as was the case in the antecedent economy? Or are we to understand that the public reading and enforcing the apostolic epistles by the bishops of a christian congregation, is not divine teaching?

Digitized by Google

3. Should a person who has heard and learned from the ancient Prophets the things concerning the Messiah, come to him by virtue of a faith in the testimony of God, be regarded as having been taught by God—as having *learned* of the Father. Is learning from the testimony that the Father gave to his Son at his baptism, or by his miracles, the same as being led by the Spirit? or think you that the "teaching of the Spirit" is the "learning of the Father."

4. Is believing on Jesus as the Messiah, and coming to him, one and the same thing in the Scripture style? John vi. 45. does not convey that idea to me. No one can come who has not believed, and no one can believe who has not heard; but yet hearing, believing, and coming appear not to me to represent the same idea in common currency of thought. And is it otherwise in the sacred style? or did not coming to Jesus denote putting oneself under his guidance; and is not this as distinct from faith as volition is from perception?

5. Should a preacher by superior eloquence gather large congregations around him, would it be an abuse of speech to say he *drew* the people after him? And should the heavenly Father, by the glory thrown around the Messiah in his miracles and doctrine, induce sinners to put themselves under his guidance, would it be incompatible either with the common use of words, or with fact, to say, that those who come to Jesus are drawn by the Father; or that no person could put himself under the Lord Jesus unless he were drawn by the Father?

6. Does the *natural man*, of whom Paul speaks to the Corinthians, agree with the natural man of the theologians of the 16th century? or was he a man guided only by his five senses, without a written revelation? In a word, were not the Greek philosophers and wise men Paul's *natural* men, who never did, by all their reasonings on nature, obtain a spiritual idea, or one of those views which the Holy Spirit suggested to the Apostles, and they to us?

7. If divine teaching and revelation are two things, as you would seem to indicate, what are we to understand by *teaching?* Is it the communication of new ideas, or is it the illustration of old ideas? And does the Spirit of God ever communicate any *ideas "above"* and *"beyond"* those found in the testimony of God, sealed by the Holy Spirit?

8. Did the Lord promise to be with his Apostles to give their word effect; or did he only say, *"I will be with you always?"* Does not John Mark explain this phrase thus, "The Lord working with them, and confirming his word by signs, or miracles accompanying"?

9. Does not 2 Cor. iv. 6. refer to the Apostles only?

Pardon me, my dear sir, for this display of items and interrogatories. On examining very closely your epistle, I found fewer phrases of that class with which I commenced than I anticipated. I found some scriptural phrases used as I am wont to conjecture in a peculiar and appropriated sense, and placing them along side of some scholastic technicalities, I did it from the conviction that it is in effect the same to deal in the speculative style and to apply scriptural terms in the speculative sense. The whole is, however, submitted to your more mature reflection.

Digitized by Google

Touching your contrast between divine and human teaching, it is clear, simple, and intelligible. But a question arises on the whole contrast of some difficulty. Suppose a preacher only reads the Divine Word in the audience of a congregation, shall we call it divine or human teaching? Or suppose he does no more than state the arguments and exhortations of the Holy Spirit, shall we call it human or divine teaching? And, pardon me, was not Paul's preaching and teaching, or that of Jesus while on earth, divine teaching? And should any person only read the New Testament, would he not be exclusively under the divine teaching?

As no living man can utter a new idea or suggestion communicated to him from the Spirit of God, not a thought which is not already eighteen hundred years in the world, it will not be contended by any intelligent person that the teaching of the Spirit extends farther than the *illustration* of what is revealed, or the *impressing* of it powerfully upon the mind. The notion which now obtains amongst those called evangelical, concerning the work of the Spirit upon the elect, when analyzed will be found to consist of illustrations and impressions. By illustrations is meant all those illuminations which suit and apply the word to individual cases. By impressions is meant that power accompanying which indelibly and irresistibly impresses it upon the heart. Could I find a comparison which would express the most plausible and popular theory, it should be drawn from a signet engraver, or from the department of seals and sealing. A particular emblem or character is engraven upon a precious stone—sealing wax is the substance on which this seal is to be impressed. A hand must accompany the seal, because the wax cannot be impressed by the seal alone, and the wax must be prepared to receive the impression.

The seal is the word written; the sinner's heart is the wax; the hand which applies it is the Spirit. The wax is so hard that the seal can make no impression upon it by its own weight—a hand must direct it, and a hand must impress it, and sometimes the seal requires a touch from the engraver to keep the impression clear and full.

All parties agree that the word written is the seal; all parties confess that the Spirit of God has engraved the seal; and all will admit that the wax is the proper figure of the heart, and also that the seal must be applied to it, or no change of heart can be accomplished.

But one party says the seal wants the stylus and burnisher in every particular case. Another contends that the wax must be always softened by heat, or no impression can be made; and a third says that if the wax be in a proper state, and the seal perfect, yet no person but the engraver himself can make an impression with it: so that the seal is of no use but while in the hand of its maker. Indeed, some contend that a seal cannot be engraven that will make an impression upon this wax in any hand but in that of its author. And some may be found who dare to affirm that the engraver alone can soften the wax, make the seal, apply, and impress it upon the wax.

It is not for us to compose such strifes; but to take the seal and to apply it as directed in the Book—rightly dividing and applying the

Digitized by Google

word of life. Touching the illustration of the seal, the impressing it upon the heart, and the softening or preparing of the heart, we may speculate by the fireside; but the faitnful preacher and successful teacher will never amuse nor perplex his audience with such speculations. For ourselves we think it incumbent on us to take the seal and use it as though it could make an impression in our hand as well as in that of its author—not, indeed, imagining but that various incidents and circumstances, sometimes special, and always providential, may soften or predispose the heart to a favorable impression.

But we cannot, with all the light we have—indeed, we dare not say to sinners, that the word of God is a dead letter until quickened by the Spirit; or that without an accompanying influence from on high no sinner can believe it; for this would be, in our judgment, to preach another gospel, if gospel it dare be called—this would be to frustrate the grace of God. I say, if gospel it could be called; for at no period of my christian life could I discover any gospel in such a proclamation as the following:—My friends, you are dead in trespasses and sins; but God has had pity upon you, and sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world. Of this the New Testament is a witness; but, alas! you cannot believe it truly unless you are aided by God's Spirit; you may believe me, but you cannot believe God, unless God himself assists you; and whether he will assist you depends upon his sovereign will or a covenant of grace, entered into from all eternity, with reference to an election of grace. If of that number, you certainly will be assisted to believe the testimony of God; if not of that number, faith is as impossible to you as the creation of a new universe.

Such a proclamation could not be "glad tidings of great joy" to any sinner under heaven, much less to all people; for unless the elect sinners knew their election of God, they could no more rejoice in such a message than the non-elect. This system, philosophic it may be, and well approved by many texts of Scripture, taken according to the rules of private interpretation, has made the gospel of non-effect more than any—more than all the traditions of the age. And certain I am that such preachers were not the Apostles nor ancient Evangelists of Jesus Christ. They "commanded ALL MEN *every where* to repent," regarding Jew, Gentile, and Samaritan as responsible subjects of God's government—as capable of hearing, believing, and obeying the gospel. They preached the achievements on Mount Calvary, the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, but no accompanying, co-operating, or assisting influences. They preached Christ, not the Holy Spirit, to all who obeyed the gospel; but no assistance nor aid supernatural to unbelievers. They never said to any sinner, 'You cannot believe, nor repent, nor obey the gospel, unless God helps you; you must pray for the Holy Spirit to assist you to believe and repent of your sins.' St. Austin, and not the Apostles of Jesus Christ, taught men thus to preach and teach christianity. Neither did they tell any man how much or how little power, capacity, or inclination he had to turn to God. Ability and inability constituted no

Digitized by Google

head or topic in apostolic discourses; nor did the Apostles ever lead any sinner to expect that God had something more to do for him in order to make him a christian than what he had done in the gift of his Son. What *was* done, and not what was *to be* done for sinners, were the elements of the Apostles' doctrine.

We have abundantly proved, not merely by arguments on paper, but by the actual fruits and products of our labors in the word, that this is the way, and the only way to preach the gospel with effect. To this preaching must be ascribed the hundreds of churches which the Lord has given us in these United States within a few years. And would or could all who now proclaim the original gospel, let the Apostles speak more, and human science and the fathers of sectarianism speak less, I doubt not that our hundreds of churches had been thousands at this very hour. But we are all improving, and the Bible and a better knowledge of men and things will ere long, I confidently hope, give new and brilliant trophies to the old apostolic gospel and manner of preaching.

We most cordially give all the glory to the grace of our God, through Jesus Christ our Lord—not unto us, but to thy name, O Lord, be all the praise! We feel and we enjoy the consolations of the Holy Spirit, and regard all true holiness as the product of that Holy One who gave utterance to the Apostles, and confirmed their testimony by its splendid displays of supernatural energy—by demonstration irresistible and overwhelming.

We cordially agree with you that the Word is not the Spirit, nor the Spirit the Word, any more than my spirit is my word, or my word my spirit. But as my spirit puts forth all its moral power by words, so does the Spirit of our God. My spirit puts forth its physical power by my physical organization, and its moral or persuasive energy by words or signs addressed to other minds: and if man is an image of God, and the creation of his Spirit, so operates the Holy One who made him.

Cudworth is a name well known to me—*Little*, wholly unknown; but Cudworth's notion I reprobate as heartily as yourself. Indeed, the tendency of such speculations to extravagance of some sort, Socinian or Deistical, has long since been deeply impressed upon my mind. We have need to take heed to the injunction, "Beware lest any man make a prey of you through an empty and deceitful philosophy, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not according to Christ."

After apologizing to you for the prosing style of this too didactic epistle, sketched in great haste on my return from a three weeks' tour, during which I had the pleasure to hear thirty-four persons of intelligence confess the Lord, and to see them buried with him in immersion, I will conclude with a short extract from one of the most vigorous and accomplished ecclesiastical writers of this century. In his work on Fanaticism, towards the close, he expresses strong hopes that the world is soon to be blessed with "the boon of an unsullied christianity;" for he frequently utters a suspicion that there is some "fatal and

Digitized by Google

occult misunderstanding of the gospel" retarding its progress in the world. His words are—

"Yet this granted—and it is unquestionable, an attendant and impartial survey of the religious history of mankind leads to the conclusion (and it is on the one hand a consolatory, as well as on the other an afflictive conclusion) that the possession of the vital elements of religion may consist with such perversions, both in theory and sentiment, as deprive christianity of its visible beauty, and forbid its propagation. Most of the examples adduced in the preceding sections come under the range of this principle; and in presenting always the illustrious and the mitigated instances rather than the exaggerated or the base, the author has steadily held to his purpose of bringing home to every mind the conviction that no degree of piety should be allowed to protect the system under which it appears from the severest scrutiny, or from grave suspicions.

"If it be asked on what ground any such suspicion can fairly rest at a time when the characteristics of freedom, vigor, and activity broadly attach to the exterior of religious profession, it may at once be replied that there must be room for serious and unsparing inquiries, so long as the actual products bear a very slender proportion to the means of general instruction—so long as christianity fails to affect the more energetic portion of the community—so long as zealous endeavors to propagate the faith abroad, though not altogether unblessed, are followed, after a long trial, with scanty successes;—but especially have we cause to suspect that some fatal and occult misunderstanding of the gospel exists, while the ecclesiastical condition of the religious commonwealth is in all senses preposterous.

"Let it be assumed that each separate article of our creed is well warranted by Scripture; it may notwithstanding be true that indefinite misconceptions, affecting the divine character and government, or that certain modes of feeling generated in evil days, and still uncorrected, exist, and operate to benumb the impulsive and expansive energies of the gospel. Our interpretation of christianity may be good, and be pure enough for private use;—it may be good in the closet, good as the source of the motives of common life; and good as the ground of hope in death, and yet may be altogether unfit for conquest and triumph. That it is so unfit, should be assumed as the only pious and becoming explication we can give of the almost universal ignorance and irreligion of mankind.

"With no very easy sense of the greatness, the difficulty, and the peril of the task to which he puts his trembling and perhaps presumptuous hand, yet from the impulse of a feeling not to be repressed, and with a resolution not to be daunted, the Author—imploring aid from on High, will ask yet again the attention and the concurrence of those who, like himself—invincibly persuaded of the truth of christianity, can taste no personal enjoyments, can admit no rest, while it falters on its course through the world."*

* Who is the real author of the Natural History of Enthusiasm? I have read his works on Enthusiasm, Spiritual Despotism, Fanaticism, his Saturday

Digitized by Google

If I have not been entirely satisfactory in these remarks in reference to your highly acceptable epistle, believe me, my very dear sir, it will afford me the highest satisfaction to hear from you still farther, and more fully on the subject, and to be corrected by your more sage consideration on these all-engrossing themes. May Heaven guide, protect and prosper you in all your ways!

With every sentiment of high esteem and unfeigned affection, I have the honor to be your brother and fellow-citizen in the kingdom of the Messiah, A. CAMPBELL.

To Dr. James Otey, Bishop of Tennessee.

Letter VI.

Dear Sir,

IT is almost fatal to the faith of any common mind, in any form of ordination as of divine authority, to examine the ancient canons, ordinals, and forms scattered over the ten thousand pages of ecclesiastic history. Among the Romanists the solemn pageant, in the lapse of centuries, became an accumulation of the most frivolous ceremonies. One could not say whether the virtue of this grace consisted in the prayers, imposition of hands, the sandals, the mitre, the ring, the crosier, the anointing, the consecrated vestments, the delivering into the hands vessels for consecrating the Eucharist, the chalice, the Bible, and the bread, or in all of them together; for at one time some part of them, at another all of them were held essential to the consecration of a bishop.

In the 3d and 4th of Edward VI. it was ordained by Parliament "that such forms of ordaining ministers as should be set forth by the advice of six prelates and six divines, to be named by the King, and authorized by the great seal, should be used after April next, and no other." Here it was absolutely entrusted to the Crown, then worn by a boy, to say what should be of divine authority. This ordinal was accordingly completed; and it is worthy of note, that the form of ordaining a Priest and a Bishop is the same, no express mention being made whether it be for the one office or the other.* This was the order of the day for three years. Some alterations were, however, made by act of Parliament, January, 1553, and thus the law of ordination for Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in the established church was introduced and completed. It is worthy of remark that the ordination practised in foreign churches was held and declared valid as that adopted by the King and Parliament down to the conclusion of the

Evening, and his Essay Introductory to Edwards on the Will, with great pleasure. In my judgment he is the finest writer in England of the present century, whose works must exert a salutary influence on the high orders of society. He is a reformer, though I suspect a Churchman. His works have greatly confirmed me in our views of reformation. His work on Despotism tastes too much of the cask—the others are excellent.

* Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. 2, page 44.

Digitized by Google

reign of Queen Elizabeth, and that during the whole reign of Edward there were but two orders of clergy or ministers recognized as authorized by the New Testament—viz. bishops and deacons; for then it was agreed by the Protestants that bishops and pricsts, or elders, were one and the same order.

The Statute Book of Elizabeth admits as valid, and consequently as of divine authority, ordination performed by presbyters alone; for at that time there were many ministers in England who had received ordination abroad in the presbyterial form, whither they had been driven by the persecutions of the "Bloody Mary," and by the aforesaid act of the Queen and Parliament their ministrations were declared as valid in England and in *heaven* as the ministrations of those ordained under the statutes of King Edward.

But more authoritative still, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the distinguished Edmund Grindall, did, on the 6th day of April, 1582, command and authorize Dr. Aubrey, his Vicar-General, to license John Morrison, a Scotch preacher, ordained by the Elders of that church, to preach and minister through the whole province of Canterbury. The words of the license are as follow:—

"Since you, the aforesaid John Morrison, about five years past, in the town of Garrat, in the county of Lothian, of the kingdom of Scotland, were admitted and ordained to sacred orders and the holy ministry, *by the imposition of hands, according to the laudable form and rite of the reformed church of Scotland:* And since the congregation of that county of Lothian is conformable to the orthodox faith, and sincere religion now received in this realm of England, and established by public authority: We, therefore, as much as lies in us, and as by right we may, *approving and ratifying the form of your ordination and preferment done in such manner aforesaid,* grant unto you a license and faculty, with the consent and express command of the most reverend father in Christ, the Lord *Edmund* by the divine providence Archbishop of Canterbury, to us signified, *That in such orders by you taken, you may, and have power in any convenient places in and throughout the whole province of Canterbury, to celebrate divine offices, to minister the sacraments,* &c. as much as in us lies; and we may *de jure,* and as far as the laws of the kingdom do allow."*

This is as explicit an approval of ordination without the hands of a bishop diocesan as could be expressed in the English tongue, and from the highest authority which Episcopacy ever claimed.

It was not, indeed, till January 12, 1588, that Dr. Bancroft, Chaplain to the Archbishop, in a sermon at Paul's Cross, boldly affirmed that the *Bishops* of England were a distinct order from Elders, and had superiority over them, *jure divino,* and directly from God. This he said was God's appointment—not, indeed, by express words, but by necessary consequence, and that the denial of it was highly heretical. This laid the foundation for new forms of ordination.

| We ought, in justice to the English clergy, to say, that these high c aims were new doctrine, and repudiated by many of the most learned.

* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. 1, page 386.

Digitized by Google

One of the most distinguished aspirants (Mr. Whitgift) said the Doctor's sermon had done much good, 'though he himself rather *wished* than *believed* it to be true doctrine.' Most of the clergy approved the superiority of the bishops on the ground of human expediency and appointment, and not on the ground of the divine right; but the bishops of the next generation revived this debate and carried their pretensions up to the full measure of Dr. Bancroft's assumption,

The merits of this controversy were not fully tried till 1640, when Bishop Hall undertook the defence of diocesan episcopacy and ordination, when the whole nation were debating whether Lord Bishops were the *Lord's* Bishops. The whole plea of diocesan episcopacy and ordination was ably and fully discussed by Bishop Hall and Smectymuus, as it has ever been done since. The controversy between Presbyterians and Episcopalians on this subject, for the last 170 years, has added but little to the lights elicited in the debate before us. The only two points in that discussion were the antiquity and authority of liturgies, and the apostolical institution of diocesan episcopacy. Bishop Hall's plea is that of Bishop Onderdonk, and Smectymuus' is that of the Presbyterians.* In the course of this discussion it was clearly proved as a matter of fact, that the diocesan bishops had ordained many persons by the imposition of their own hands alone in private chapels; while Bishop Hall contended that bishops alone, without the hands of presbyters, ought not to ordain, and asserted that bishops alone had not ordained in England. We only allude to this controversy for the fact developed and proved by the most satisfactory testimony, that the forms of ordination and the doctrine of ordination was any thing but uniform, even among the supporters of diocesan episcopacy, from the dawn of the Reformation down to the times of Charles I.

So unsettled were matters of ordination, both as to form and meaning, in England, in the year 1644, that the Parliament, October 2, 1644, although episcopalian in its views, appointed a committee of ten preaching elders, members of the Assembly of Divines, with power "to examine and ordain by imposition of hands all those whom they shall judge qualified to be admitted into the sacred ministry." They also appointed an ordaining committee for the city of London, seven elders of which should constitute a quorum, none of whom were members of the Assembly of Divines; and all persons to be ordained by these were to be afterwards reputed Ministers of the Church of England and eligible to all its honors and emoluments. These committees, and one for the county of Lancaster were all *pro tempore* institutions, and ordained for the present exigencies.

Lay preachers about this time began to attract attention, especially in the army, and to prevent irresponsible and unqualified preachers, the Parliament ordained, April 26, "That no person shall be permit-

* For the information of some of our readers it ought to be stated that Stephen Marshal, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Mather Newcomen, and William Spuston were the authors represented by *Smectymuus*—a word compосed of the initials of all their names.

Digitized by Google

ted to preach who is not ordained a minister in this or some other reformed church, except such as intend the ministry, who shall be allowed for the trial of their gifts, by those that shall be appointed thereunto by both houses of Parliament; and it is earnestly desired, that Sir Thomas Fairfax take care that this ordinance be put in execution in the army. It is further ordered to be sent to the Lord Mayor, and committee of the militia in London; to the governors and commanders of all forts, garrisons, forces, cities, and towns, with the like injunction; and the mayor, sheriffs, and justices of the peace are to commit all offenders to safe custody, and give notice to the Parliament; who will take a speedy course for their punishment."

The ordinance sets forth, "That whereas the words *presbyter* and *bishop* do in scripture signify the same function, though the title of *bishop* has been, appropriated to one, who has assumed to himself, in the matter of ordination, that which was not meet; which ordination, notwithstanding being performed by him, we hold for substance to be valid, and not to be disclaimed by any that have received it; and whereas it is manifest that *ordination*, that is, *an outward solemn setting apart of persons for the office of the ministry in the church by preaching presbyters*, is an institution of Christ, it is therefore ordained by the lords and commons, with the advice of the assembly of divines at Westminster, that the several and respective classical presbyters within their respective bounds may examine, approve, and ordain presbyters, according to the following directory —

1. "The person to be ordained must apply to the presbytery, with a testimonial of his taking the covenant, of his proficiency in his studies," &c.

2. "He is then to pass under an examination as to his religion and learning, and call to the ministry."

"After examination he shall receive a public testimonial from his examiners, which shall be read publicly before the people, and then fixed to the door of the church where he preaches for approbation, with liberty to any person or persons to make exceptions.

"Upon the day of ordination a solemn fast shall be kept by the congregation, when, after a sermon, the person to be ordained shall make a public confession of his faith, and declare his resolution to be diligent and constant in the discharge of his pastoral duty. After which he shall be separated, or set apart to the pastoral office with a short prayer, and the laying on of the hands of the ministers present. After the ordination, there is to be an exhortation to minister and people, and the whole *solemnity* to conclude with a *psalm* and a *prayer*.

It is further declared, "That all ordinations, according to the former usage of the Church of England, as well as those of Scotland, and other reformed churches, shall be esteemed valid.

"A register is to be kept by every presbytery of the names of the persons ordained by them, of the ministers concerned, and of the time and place where they were settled. No money or gift whatsoever shall be received from the person ordained, or from any on his behalf,

Digitized by Google

for his ordination, or any thing relating to it, except for the instruments or testimonials, which shall not exceed ten shillings.

Lastly, it is resolved, "That all persons ordained according to this *directory*, shall be forever reputed and taken to all intents and purposes, for lawfully and sufficiently authorized ministers of the Church of England, and as capable of any ministerial employment in the church, as any other presbyter already ordained, or hereafter to be ordained."

Such documents, my dear sir, you are aware can be increased *ad libitum*, all evincing any thing but uniformity in sentiment or practice amongst Protestants on this subject of ordination. And on any view which can be taken of the whole premises, may we not say that it is forever impossible to trace up to the Apostles or first Bishops, by lineal descent, any official authority claimed by any prelate in Europe or America. The descent has been so often and so anciently corrupted by intermarriages, that there is not one drop of pure Episcopal blood on earth. Mr. Barnes, of Philadelphia, whose work fell into my hands the other day, in his examination of Episcopacy has given some extracts that show a very early contamination of it in England.

"We are informed by many ancient historians, and very expressly by Bede, in his famous Ecclesiastical History, that 'at the request of Oswald, king of Northumberland, certain *presbyters* came (in the seventh century) from Scotland into England, and ordained bishops; that the abbot, and *other presbyters* of the island of Hy, sent Aydan for this express purpose, declaring him to be worthy of the office of bishop, and that he ought to be sent to instruct the unbelieving and the unlearned.' He informs us, that 'those presbyters ordained him and sent him to England on this errand; and that Finan, sent from the same monastery in the same island, succeeded him in the Episcopal office, after having been ordained by the Scottish presbyters."

"Upon this testimony of Bede, Baxter remarks, 'You will find that the English had a *succession* of bishops by the *Scottish presbyter's ordination;* and there is no mention in Bede of any dislike or scruple of the lawfulness of this course. The learned Dr. Doddridge refers us to Bede and Jones, to substantiate the fact, that 'the ordination of English bishops cannot be traced up to the church of Rome as its original; that in the year 668, the successors of Austin, the monk, (who came over A. D. 596,) being almost extinct, *by far the greater part* of the bishops were of Scottish ordination, by Aydan and Finan, who came out of the Culdee monastery of Columbanus, and were no more than *presbyters.*' "

The argument that obtrudes itself upon us from these records, is, that if only ten bishops were thus created eleven hundred years ago, there is no calculating to what extent the contamination has spread throughout England and America. The ordination of presbyters may, then, be the fountain of all the episcopal power and official grace in the Protestant world. And, perhaps, these very Scotch elders had not even presbyterial ordination themselves pure and uncorrupt. Theirs

Digitized by Google

may have been tainted by lay ordination, of which we shall yet have to speak more particularly, but not till we have considered the subject in a new attitude. This is intended for my next.

As ever, with all respect and esteem, &c.

EDITOR.

Evidences of the Gospel---No. 3.

HAVING shown that no man in his senses can be an antitheist, or can affirm that there is no God, unless he assume that he comprehends the universe in his mind, with all its abstract essences and principles; which assumption would be to make himself omnipresent and eternal, a god in fact; and having seen that the proposition of the divine existence and perfections is demonstrable from the universe, as far as it is known in all its general laws and in all its parts, we proceed from these prefatory considerations to other matters still more intimately introductory to our design.

It is essentially preliminary to a clear and forcible display of the reasonableness and certainty of our faith in Jesus Christ as the author of immortality to man, that we ascertain the proper ground on which the modern sceptic, of whatever creed, stands, when he avows his opposition to the gospel. That we may duly estimate the strength of his opposition, we must not only enumerate his objections or arguments, but we must exactly ascertain the exact position which he occupies. Does he stand within a fortified castle, or in the open field? Presents he himself to our view in a strong hold, well garrisoned with the invincible forces of logic, of science, and of fact? or defies he armies and the artillery of light, relying wholly upon himself, his own experience, without a shield, without an ally, without science, without history, and consequently without a single fact to oppose?

That we may, then, truly and certainly ascertain his precise attitude, before we directly address him we shall accurately survey his whole premises.

Does he say that he *knows* the gospel to be false? No, he cannot; for he was not in Judea in the days of the evangelical drama. He, therefore, could not test the miracles, or sensible demonstrations, by any of his senses; nor prove to himself that Jesus rose not from the dead. Speaking in accordance with the evidence of sense, of consciousness, and of experience, he never can say that he *knows* the gospel to be a cunningly devised fable. He has not, then, in all his premises, *knowledge*, in its true and proper meaning, to oppose to the christian's faith or hope. What remains?

Can he say, in truth, that he *believes* the gospel to be false? He cannot; because belief without testimony is impossible. And testimony that the gospel facts did not occur is not found extant on earth in any language or nation under heaven. No contemporaneous opposing testimony has ever been heard of except in one instance;—the sleeping and incredible testimony of the Roman guard, which has

Digitized by Google

a lie stamped indelibly on its forehead—"His disciples stole his dead body while we were asleep." He that can believe this is not to be reasoned with. We repeat it with emphasis, that no living man can say, according to the English Dictionary, that he *believes* the gospel to be false.

Alike destitute of knowledge and of faith to oppose to the testimony of Apostles, Prophets, and myriads of contemporaneous witnesses, what has the sceptic to present against the numerous and diversified evidences of the gospel? Nothing in the universe but his *doubts*. He can, in strict conformity to language and fact, only say, he doubts whether it be true. He is, then, legitimately no more than an inmate of *Doubting Castle*. His fortification is built up of doubts and misgivings, cemented by antipathy. Farther than this the powers of nature and of reason cannot go.

How far these doubts are rational, scientific, and modest, may yet appear in the sequel; meanwhile, we only survey the premises which the infidel occupies, and the forces he has to bring into the action. These, may we not say, are already logically ascertained to be an army of doubts only.

Some talk of the immodesty, others of the folly, others of the maliciousness of the unbeliever; but not to deal in harsh or uncourteous epithets, may we not say, that it is most unphilosophic to dogmatize against the gospel on the slender grounds of sheer dubiety! No man, deserving the name of a *philosopher*, can ever appear among the crusading forces of pamphleteers and declaimers against the faith of christians—for two of the best reasons in the world;—he has nothing better to substitute for the motives;—the restraining fears to the wicked, and the animating hopes to the righteous, which the gospel tenders;—and he has nothing to oppose to its claims but the weakness and uncertainty of his doubts. Franklin was a philosopher, but Paine was a madman. The former doubted, but never dogmatized—never opposed the gospel, but always discountenanced and discouraged the infidel: the latter gave to his doubts the authority of oracles, and madly attempted to silence the christian's artillery by the licentious scoffings of the most extravagant and unreasonable scepticism.

Modesty is the legitimate daughter of true philosophy; but dogmatism, unless the offspring of infallible authority, is the ill bred child of ignorance and arrogance. Every man, then, who seeks to make proselytes to his scepticism by converting his doubts into arguments, is any thing but a philosopher, or a philanthropist.

One of the most alarming signs of this age is the ignorance and recklessness of the youthful assailants of the Bible. Our cities, villages, and public places of resort are thronged with swarms of these Lilliputian volunteers in the cause of scepticism. Apprenticed stripplings, and sprigs of law and physic, whose whole reading of standard authors on general science, religion, or morality, in ordinary duodecimo, equals not the years of their unfinished, or just completed minority, imagine they have got far in advance of the vulgar herd, and are both philosophers and gentlemen if they have learned, at second hand,

Digitized by Google

a few scoffs and sneers at the Bible, from Paine, Voltaire, Bolingbroke, or Hume. One would think, could he listen to their impudence, that Bacon, Newton, Locke, and all the great masters of science were very pigmies, and that they themselves were sturdy giants of extraordinary stature in all that is intellectual, philosophic, and learned. These would-be baby demagogues are a public nuisance to society, whose atheistic breath not unfrequently pollutes the whole atmosphere around them, and issues in a moral pestilence among that class who regard a fine hat and a cigar as the infallible criteria of a gentleman and scholar.

These creatures have not sense enough to doubt, nor to think sedately on any subject; and, therefore, we only notice them while defining the ground occupied by the unbelievers of this generation. They prudently call themselves *sceptics*, but imprudently carry their opposition to the Bible beyond all the bounds embraced in their own definitions of scepticism. A sceptic can only *doubt*, never *oppugn* the gospel. He becomes an atheist or an infidel, bold and dogmatic, soon as he opens his mouth against the Bible.

Were we philosophically to class society as it now exists in this country, in reference to the gospel, we should have believers, unbelievers, and sceptics. We would find somo who have voluntarily received the apostolic testimony as true; others who have rejected it as false; and a third class who simply doubt, and neither receive nor reject it as a communication from Heaven. But though unbelievers, while they call themselves sceptics, often wage actual war against the faith and hope of christians, still their actual rejection of the gospel has no other foundation than pure aversion to its restraints and some doubts as to its authenticity. The quagmire of their own doubts, be it distinctly remembered, is the sole ground occupied by all the opponents of the gospel, whether they style themselves antitheists, atheists, theists, unbelievers, or sceptics.

That these doubts are perfectly irrational, or that they legitimately issue in absolute scepticism in all that is called science and philosophy, we shall attempt to show in our next essay. The plan which we have proposed to ourselves in these occasional essays is first to explode the lying refuges of every species of scepticism—then to show that it is *possible*—then that it is *probable*—then that it is *morally certain*—and then that it is *experimentally true* that Jesus the Nazarene is the author of an eternal salvation to all that obey him.

EDITOR.

Reformation---No. 8.

LIBERALITY.

WHEN a person becomes a member or citizen of any state, the constitutional compact secures to him all that the government can bestow, and it also secures him and all that he has to the support of the state. His person, talents, property, and all that he calls his own, belong to the state; and all the

Digitized by Google

privileges, immunities, and rights which the state has to bestow on its citizens belong, by constitutional right and guarantee, to him. Hence if the state want his person, his talents, or his property, or any portion of his talents or property, it levies upon it without any apology, by virtue of the social covenant. The benefits which he expects from civilized and social life, compared with the savage state, or the simple state of nature, authorize him to make such a surrender of his person, talents, and property as the state requires for the pledges which it stipulates to him. Such is the nature and design of the national compact.

Now be it observed, that the imposts or taxes levied upon his time, his talents, or his property, for the simple support of the national compact, are always regarded not as bounties or donations, but as just debts. Therefore, when a person pays off all the imposts of the government, he does no more than pay off a debt, which he has, by his naturalization or birth, contracted. So far justice, and not generosity, demands. But should he, after paying off all such taxes to the last farthing, consider that by volunteering his services personal, or by making a donation of land or money, out of pure patriotism for some public interest, which may either extend the resources or the territory of the state, and should actually tender such services or such donation; then is it that he acts liberally, and such appropriations of time or money are regarded as bounties, favors, or gifts to the whole community, which secure to him not merely the character of a just, but of a generous man.

Now is it otherwise in the kingdom of Heaven? Is not the christian community a religious commonwealth, under a government which guaranties to it the greatest—even spiritual and eternal immunities and privileges? And is not every citizen, from the instant of his adoption or regeneration, secured and transferred to the community, body, soul, spirit, and property? Does not the government claim his person, talents, and property, so far as it needs him, or his talents, and property, in consideration of the immense privileges which the constitution guaranties to him. Does not the law of Christ require the same—and does it not propound this as a fundamental maxim on which it bases all its claims—"YOU ARE NOT YOUR OWN"—"*All things are yours*"—"YOU ARE CHRIST'S *property*."

Now if personal services or property are of any account in the kingdom of Heaven, or church of Christ, will not all that we have said on the social compact, by the most exact analogy, apply to the christian community? For so all the *names* and *characters* of the house, family, kingdom, city, or holy nation of God undeniably indicate.

The first question of importance, then, is, Are personal services or property of any account in the church? Does the Lord *need* them? Has he placed himself and his people in such earthly circumstances as to need men's services, talents, or property for the extension of the territory of his kingdom, (the multiplication of its citizens,) or for the comfort and happiness of the community under his presidency? Most certainly he has: for as clearly and unequivocally as Jesus once said of a colt, "*The Master needs it*," so clearly has he and his Apostles called for the *ministrations* of his people in personal services, talents, and earthly substance. Nay, the Lord sometimes condescends to *borrow* from his disciples, as a father borrows from his children the property he has given them: "He that giveth to the poor" in advance of his just dues to them, "*lends* to the Lord." But it is not of charity we now write. The Lord "has *ordained* that they who preach the gospel should *live by the gospel*." Not only the Apostles who first announced it, but "others partook of this authority" to live by the gospel, and "*the Apostles rather*." 1 Cor. ix. 14. "Contributions for the gospel" is a part, and only a part, of the christian's tax in the kingdom of Heaven. I will not argue this as if it were a matter of dispute, for it is not. It is as clear as that there is a gospel, and that Christ commanded it to be preached and taught. The law, Paul says, taught it—the gospel ordains it—and reason sanctions it.

Digitized by Google

But the question is, On what *principle* must these gracious imposts of the christian government be levied? Paul decides as the laws of our American government decide—not on the principle of *gratuitous donations*—not on the principles of generosity and liberality; but on the principles of immutable *justice*. "I mean," says Paul, "EQUALITY"—"not that one should be eased, and another burdened." I mean *equality;* and what is equality but justice!

This reminds us of a suggestion made to me by brother Thomas Bullock, of Versailles, Kentucky, last April. 'Our brethren,' said he, 'wish to be *liberal* in supporting the government of Jesus Christ. I want to be first just, then liberal. Now the difficulty with many is, How shall we have equality or justice in all contributions for our government? My plan, continued he, would be as follows:—

'The state, in its wisdom, aiming at equality, has levied taxes, ad valorem, on our property; so that every man's political tax and imposts are levied on a just principle—he that has most property pays most to the government; because he has most at stake, or because he has derived the most benefit from it. Now, said he, as we at least owe as much to the government of Heaven as to the government of the state, I am willing that on the ground of simple justice we pay on the same ratio to the furtherance of our spiritual privileges, annually, as much as we pay to the state. Let this be adopted as a basis principle, and if every church in the union paid as much annually into the Lord's treasury as into the state treasury, we would then see how much was left to our *liberality*. I would not, indeed, make the pittance of our political taxes the standard of our obligations to the government of Jesus Christ; but I would fix it as a sort of minimum to ascertain equality; and then, this being paid as the lowest demand of justice, let the brethren talk of liberality.'

It is not so much admiration of the plan, as it is of the principle recognized in the suggestion, that we quote from our recollections so largely. Yet as many brethren often seem at a loss to find some standard of justice in these matters, it may not be amiss to state that they have in the suggestion a principle which would at once introduce equality at the minimum demands of justice. I have, however, too high an opinion of the good sense of our brethren to imagine that any of them would think so meanly of the government of Jesus Christ, and of their privileges, temporal and spiritual, derived from it, as to make its demands no more imperious, obligatory, or enlarged than those of the state government for its guarantee of political advantages.

But, really, I am sometimes astonished to hear persons talk of liberality to Jesus Christ, who have not come up to the minimum demands of justice to his government.

It is sometimes said that we are to blame for this, having said so much against the hireling systems now in fashion. On that subject we have, indeed, written much; but if any one confound the views inculcated in this essay with the system we denominate the hireling system, he has mistaken us altogether. The hireling is one who works for wages merely; but every one who receives wages is not a hireling. Were that the truth, then Paul himself was a hireling; for he says, "*I received wages* of other churches to do you service." There is priestcraft, and in opposing that, shall we establish laycraft!? And, indeed, when I see men sent out by congregations to republish the gospel, and impoverished by their labors so as to become objects of sympathy, if not of positive charity—then I think it is time to watch against laycraft, if indeed we ought to use the word priestcraft or laycraft at all.

But the only point now before us is to remind the brethren that in coming into the kingdom of Heaven, they have surrendered themselves and all that they have to Jesus Christ, and as far as they judge he needs their services it is their honor and their duty to contribute—according to equality? No; but according to ability and exigency. I thank the Lord that I write not thus that so it should be done to me; but I write thus that it should be so done to the brethren who labor in the word, and whose modesty and devotion to the Lord and the brethren, forbid their opening the law or the testimony on this topic

Digitized by Google

I have already volunteered twenty-five years of my life, and by far the best part of it, at my own expense and charges, without wages; and I intend so to continue, while the Lord enables me, and am willing to pay the tenth of all, or any other ratio the brethren may adopt, for the furtherance of the gospel and the extension and support of the government of Jesus Christ.

EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

STREETSBOROUGH, *Ohio*, July 17, 1835.

WE are going on slowly, I think, in every respect. Brother M. Clapp, I learn, has triumphed over a noted sceptic in Elyria, in public debate. It being court week, there were many present. We have also immersed a good many since May last. But all that is done and doing only shows what might be done if we increased in zeal and unanimity of exertion only as much as we do in knowledge and wisdom in handling the word of the Lord.

WILLIAM HAYDEN.

LA FAYETTE, Chambers County, *Alabama*, July 12, 1834.

IT gives me great pleasure to be enabled to write you that the gospel of Jesus Christ is gaining some friends at this place. There are many here who profess to believe the Record of God, but few take it for their guide in faith or practice without a human creed appended.

About five weeks since I set forth in a public discourse the scripture view of Christ's church, or, more properly, the testimony of the Prophets and Apostles on the subject. At the close of it I proposed to unite with every immersed believer, of good behaviour, present, as a church of Jesus Christ. That day nine united with me on the foundation of the Apostles, and without the sanction of any Priest we commemorated the death and sufferings of the Saviour in the Supper. Last Sunday we received ten more, making in all twenty. I immersed three last Lord's day upon a profession of their faith in Christ. We begin to feel the wrath of Priests; but we find the favor of the King, and this compensates us. We begin in earnest to search the Scriptures, and we wish to get any assistance we can in this work. We are determined to follow no man, but to examine into every thing which has a bearing upon the question of our duty to God, to each other, or the world around us. We are called "C——ites," but we pay no attention to such things. We tell them that we are determined to make every effort to reform all the sects. This generally stops their mouths. Pray for us that we may courageously pursue "the good old way."

JOHN M. BARNES.

WADSWORTH, *Ohio*, July 15, 1835.

I HAVE just returned home from a tour of two weeks through Lorain and Huron counties, and I found that the gospel will have more effect in those parts than I had anticipated in consequence of the clerical influence. I have baptized nine since our Shalersville meeting in June—my youngest brother and sister are included in the number. We had a four days' meeting in Boonsen, Huron county, where they never heard the truth fairly before, or, at least, many of them. Brother Leonard, from Canfield, has moved his family there, and has exerted himself much in the good cause. He endeavors to hold forth the word of life, but public opinion was so strong against him that he could not do much. I think, however, that there is a very favorable impression left on the minds of very many who were much opposed before. The first day of our meeting only fifteen or twenty attended; the second day, a very good congrega-

Digitized by Google

tion; the third day nearly 400 attended; and on Monday a large congregation again convened, paying great attention. One baptized, and three Regular Baptists acknowledged the faith. The people seemed much affected.

ALMON B. GREEN.

From the Gospel Advocate.

I wrote you in February, that brethren Anderson and Griffin would ride in this section. They have been regularly proclaiming as expected. They are, one or both of them with us every two or three weeks. Some six or seven have been added to our congregation since I wrote you, and a few in other places in the range of their labors. With us the people, or at least some of them, are very attentive; and some seem to take much interest in the prosperity of the cause. May the Lord bless the people—and the brethren in their labors in the cause of the Lord; and may the Lord sustain you, brethren, in your labors to enlighten the people, and show the feebleness of men's inventions to save them.

D. R. GOOCH.

CAMDEN, *N. J.* August 17, 1835.

IT will without doubt gratify you to hear of the prosperity and increase of the church in Bank street, Philadelphia. Brother George Elley, of Lexington, Ky. has been with us for two or three weeks, proclaiming the word of life on Lord's day and Tuesday evenings. Five persons, two males and three females, obeyed the gospel, being immersed by him for the remission of sins. They have united with us to walk in the institutions of the kingdom. May peace and joy attend them to the end of the race!

The church is now walking in the fellowship of the gospel, attending weekly (and I trust daily in our individual capacity) to the commandments of the Lord our Master. We number between 70 and 80, and there are of this number ten or eleven who take part in the public exercises of teaching, exhortation, and prayer.

We have for some time been thinking and talking of a co-operation with the brethren in New York and Baltimore, for the spread of the gospel in these eastern cities. Brother Hendrickson, from New York, has been with us. He is warm in the cause, and anxious that something may be done. He says the brethren in New York are ready to engage in the work. Brother Henshall, of Baltimore, is expected among us some time this month. He is also hearty in the measure, and thinks the Baltimore brethren will unite. Of ourselves it may be said with truth, I believe, there is but one mind on the subject. All see the importance of enlightening the public mind on the true nature of Christ's kingdom.

Our beloved brother Ballantine still continues to groan in the earthly house of his tabernacle, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon, that mortality may be swallowed up of life. He has been wonderfully supported in the midst of his protracted and distressing sickness; seldom able to see his friends, he yet rejoices in Jesus, magnifying the name of his heavenly Father.

J. L. RHEES.

LOUISA, *Va.* August 29, 1835.

I TAKE this opportunity to let you know that the gospel is triumphing in this neighborhood beyond our most sanguine expectations; and that opposition of which you know we have had much, has almost hid its deformed head. On the 5th we immersed two; and again on the 15th we immersed two others, a young man and his wife, of whose usefulness we entertain good hope. It would have given you joy to see with what earnestness they came forward to confess their Lord and Master, and then the rejoicing of the disciples! Again, on the 23d, we immersed three others. Praised be the Lord!

At a co-operation meeting of the disciples, held at Bethany, in this county, about the first of this month, they manifested their willingness to contribute for the gospel, and it is probable that our beloved brother Higgason will do the work of an evangelist in this region for the next year.

Digitized by Google

I would also state, that having just returned from a similar meeting, held in Caroline county, at Antioch, on the 8th and 9th instant, the brethren there seemed alive to the subject of contribution; and it is likely they will procure the labors of brother Henshall, of Baltimore, whose abilities, I should suppose, from a slight acquaintance, are such as to qualify him, in an eminent degree, for the work of an evangelist. Two persons confessed the Lord at the meeting and were immersed.

The disciples at Bethany are walking in the truth. Remember me affectionately to Father Campbell; I long to see him, and should be glad if he would write to me. My address is 'Locust creek, Louisa county, Va.'

JAMES M. BAGBY.

JACKSONVILLE, *Ind.* August 18, 1835.

YOU do not like long letters; nor do I, unless very interesting. Every thing flourishes here but religion—this is very sickly, and almost sick unto death. "Like people, like priest." The preachers have almost left the field and only preach when it suits their convenience. I can say with Paul, though old, I labor more abundantly than all. I have baptized and received for baptism about 10 in eight or ten days, not in Jacksonville. In this place I hardly ever speak. What think you of the plan now proposed of the general union of christians? The paper is published in Marysville, Tenn. by Episcopalians and Presbyterians. I should be glad to know your thoughts on the subject.

B. W. STONE.

FRANKLIN, *Ill.* August 8, 1835.

THE congregation in Rushville numbers I think 65 members. They meet every First Day to break the loaf in commemoration of our Lord's death and for mutual exhortation, which they attend to with profit. They have no "*preacher*"—have never had. The teaching brethren occasionally call on them in passing, and it is desirable they could do so more frequently than they now do. They are about to build a meeting house, 30 by 40 feet, which they intend completing against the October meeting—a plain frame.

H. A. CYRUS.

MIDDLETOWN, *Va.* September 8, 1835.

ON the 29th of August I left Baltimore in company with brother Charles Farquharson, for Washington county, Md.; and on arriving at Boonsborough we heard that brother S. K. Hoshour was to preach that evening in Hagerstown, and thither we both went. We arrived just before he began to preach, and were unobserved and unknown to him until he had finished his discourse. The Town Hall was full of attentive hearers, and they were profitably addressed from John iii. 1—12. After preaching two determined to change their state—to come out of the kingdom of *the clergy*, which is a kingdom of darkness, into the kingdom of God's dear Son. The people here are very much in trouble on the subject of religion; and the greatest misfortune is, that brother Hoshour cannot stay in these parts to teach them the right ways of the Lord. The Lord *knows* why he does not stay, and I am right glad it is not *his* fault.

Brother Farquharson and I had a two days meeting in the neighborhood of Middletown, Md. Brother F. exhorted the disciples publicly and privately concerning the kingdom of God, while I set before sinners the way of salvation. I preached twice on Beaver creek, and baptized two. We then met with brother Ferguson, near Williamsport, and heard him preach. Brother Farquharson then returned to Baltimore, and I went with brother Ferguson to the Valley of Virginia, to a big meeting in Shenandoah county. I have known brother F. five years. He was a preacher among the Christians, but he has come wholly into the reformation—not theoretically, like many; but *practically*. He has carried out the principles on which the Christians first set out, while many of their teachers have swerved into the veriest *sectarianism*. There are a great many in these parts who love the truth, and are determined to practise it. These are forming themselves into bodies to break the loaf each first day; and from the intelligence of the brethren generally, and their great love of

Digitized by Google

God's word, I have no doubt but they will be happy in the obedience of the truth. We baptized five at the meeting, which was held in the neighborhood of brother David Stickley's. The brethren wish the proclaimers who pass this way to visit them. Sectarianism abounds, and the truth lacks advocates. Alas! for those disciples who can look on the present state of things, and be in possession of talents and not use them! But I must quit, having travelled forty miles to day on horseback. Yours, JAMES HENSHALL.

WALKERTOWN, King & Queen, *Va.* August 12, 1835.

OUR progress and prospects we wish to make known to you and the disciples. Our cause is yours and theirs. Our foundation, our joys, our sorrows, and our hopes are not our own alone, but are yours and theirs. The congregations at Antioch, Smyrna, and the Rappahannock have, by their conformity to the apostolic order, established their cearacter as the disciples of Jesus Christ. They have given evidence to every unprejudiced mind that they will maintain the original apostolic gospel. Their steadfastness and contributions to the support of the gospel has caused many to examine if such were the precepts and examples of the Apostles and primitive christians. Brother Henshall, of Baltimore, has been with us, and confirmed the teachings of the public teachers that labor in these congregations. There have been about twenty added to these congregations in about eight days. The prospect at this time is quite cheering. The congregations attending upon the proclamation of the gospel generally are large; prejudices, except with the sects and a few such professors as the "*Let them alone,*" in the Evangelist, are giving way to principles. Some truly respectable characters, both male and female, have submitted themselves to the teaching of Jesus Christ and his Apostles—some who have listened to the dogmas of the sects between thirty and forty years, and did not feel justified in obeying the gospel until lately. Great efforts, I have heard, were made to prejudice their minds against us, and secure them in the vortex of sectarianism. They had, however, independence enough to hear and act for themselves, as all should do. There are some promising young men added, also, young women. Among the number is my oldest son, the Doctor. What joy was it to my spirit to see him arise and approach his companion to inquire of her if she was ready and willing to go with him to confess that Jesus was the Son of God, and enter into his kingdom that they might enjoy his salvation. It was affecting to see him take leave of her, as she was not fully persuaded in her own mind. May he prove a physician to the souls and bodies of his fellow beings! T. M. HENLEY.

CLAY COUNTY, *Mo.* August 11, 1835.

THE congregation of disciples in this county are growing in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, and gradually increasing in number. We now number about sixty. G. W. HOPKINS.

The church in Baltimore still continues to increase. Brother Carman, under date of August 21, says, "There were immersed in the meeting-house on Monday evening three persons, two of which were a man and his wife, upwards of 70 years old. She was, moreover, stone blind."

SCHOOL OF THE PREACHERS.

IT was agreed by all those who labor in the word and teaching, present at the annual meeting in Newburg, Ohio, to have stated meetings for their own edification in the matter and manner of public instruction in the christian religion. All the brethren are sensible that they have not attained the highest degree of excellence in the *manner* of contending for the faith formerly delivered to the saints; and even the matter of their public discourses is not, themselves being judges, always what it ought to be. At present there is no means of improvement but in the slow and gradual development of the school of experience, aided by the censures and criticisms of the more discriminating of society, and frequently these are not the most friendly to their improvement;

Digitized by Google

for these criticisms, commendations, and censures are not made to themselves, so not designed for their benefit; but they are either publicly expressed or secretly whispered to their disadvantage.

To remedy these imperfections, and more rationally and scripturally to qualify each other for public usefulness, in the absence of all other means for the schooling of our proclaimers suitably to the present exigencies, we have agreed to meet occasionally at some one central place, say quarterly, if practicable, under the following regulations:—

1. All the preaching itinerant brethren in a given district, and all those who teach in particular congregations are punctually to attend for one week, from time to time, on their own adjournments, in such village or place as may be agreed upon by a majority of the brethren present.

2. At these meetings the proclaimers of the word shall each deliver one discourse, of one hour, prepared in the best possible manner, before all who may please to attend.

3. These discourses shall then be examined freely as to matter and manner, in committee of the whole, preaching and teaching brethren alone.

4. Some subject at each meeting shall be selected and agreed upon for the careful study of the brethren during the interval of these meetings, so that a proper direction may be given to their reading and reflections; and on the subject assigned they shall be severally interrogated, and shall interrogate one another during the meetings at such times as shall be agreed on.

The first of these meetings shall be held by appointment at *New Lisbon*, Columbiana county, Ohio, to commence on the Saturday before the first Lord's day in December next, and to continue till the Friday following. All the brethren above described on the Western Reserve and surrounding country are invited and expected to attend. Although a Virginian, I expect to be present.

The subject of investigation at the first meeting, it is agreed upon shall be, *the Principles and Rules of interpreting the Scriptures*, as sketched in part 1st, "Christianity Restored." EDITOR.

MR. LYND'S IMPROVED LOGIC.

JAMESTOWN, Ohio, 29th June, 1835.

Beloved brother Campbell,

I DO not expect you have seen a new periodical, called "*The Baptist Advocate*," published at Cincinnati, Ohio, edited or conducted by J. Stephens, L. W. Lynd, J. M. Peck, L. Holman, R. T. Dillard, and R. P. C. Howell.

I have hastily glanced over two essays of Mr. Lynd's on Regeneration, in which he has *metamorphosed* and *figured* until he has worked *water* out of the NEW BIRTH spoken of by our Lord to Nicodemus. He comes out boldly and denies *that to be "born of water" means baptism in water*. But with him water does not mean water, nor is baptism to be understood where water is mentioned; and you will laugh at his reason why. Here, then, you have it: Because "the angel found Hagar by a fountain of *water*"—"And there shall come *water* out of the rock"—"He falleth oft into the fire and into the *water*"—"These are wells without *water*." These do not allude to baptism; therefore we are to infer that the expression '*to be born of water*' does not allude to *baptism*. This is the jut of Mr. Lynd's argument.

He says the word *born* is used figuratively in the passage; but, with him to be born of *water* is no figure of a birth at all; nor does

he say what it is—whether it would be a real birth in his estimation, or not, we are left to guess; but he strives hard to make out a *figurative birth* without any *figure* of a birth.

I have never seen as hard a struggle by any Paidobaptist to keep out of the water, in entering into the kingdom of God, as is here made by Mr. Lynd.——In haste, yours, W. WINANS.

THE BISHOP OF CHESTER.

THE Right Reverend, the Bishop of Chester, stated in his Charge to the Clergy of Liverpool, and we suppose to the Clergy in other towns also, that "Heaven seems to have a controversy with the Church of England." Surely, the Hierarchy will not continue a controversy of so peculiar and imposing a nature.—*Missionary Chronicle.*

☞WE had a very pleasant tour of 300 miles in Ohio, attended two of the annual meetings on the Reserve, and joyfully reciprocated the christian greetings of many excellent disciples. The meetings were well attended by the brethren and citizens, though the weather was by no means the most propitious. At Bazetta eleven were immersed; at Newburg, fourtcen; and at other points we visited, eight. In all thirty-three confessed the Lord during the tour of twenty days. Six also were immersed at Greenville, at a meeting held by the brethren in that vicinity, at the time of the Bazetta meeting. The prospects upon the whole are propitious, as many churches are awaking to the weight and importance of their obligations to co-operate in the use of proper means for the conversion of the world. The harvest is truly great, and the laborers indeed are comparatively few, very few. May the Lord of the harvest send out laborers to reap it! honest men and skilful workmen, who will not spend their time in quarrelling with their neighbors in gathering briars, but in gathering fruit to eternal life! EDITOR.

TOUR TO THE EAST.

WE have for many years been purposing to visit New York state and New England, but we have hitherto been prevented. We had early in the season hopes of spending the one-fourth of this year in those regions; but the immense labors of our last south-western tour so impaired our energies that we are compelled to diminish both our labors of the tongue and pen for the present. We purpose to spend May, June, and July next year, the Lord willing, in that quarter of our country. Our correspondents will please forgive our remissness in attending to their communications. Our will is strong, but our abilities are weak. EDITOR.

☞THE Annual Meeting for 1836, of the churches in the county of Trumbull, Ohio, will be held at CANFIELD, commencing the Friday before the last Lord's day in August; and that for the churches in Cuyahoga, Huron, and the surrounding country, at WADSWORTH, Medina county, commencing one week after the former—that is, on the Friday before the first Lord's day in September. We have not yet heard from the Geauga and Ashtabula annual meeting at Mentor for the present year.

☞Several communications for the present number are reluctantly deferred, especially some from Elder Ballantine; also, some remarks in reply to brother Du Val, with various Queries and other articles. Our regular series is also interrupted; but we must be governed in a good measure by circumstances. No. 3. on John's Immersion is received.

Digitized by Google

ORDER.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

MILLENIAL HARBINGER—EXTRA.

Number VIII.

Bethany, Va. October, 1835.

ORDER.

THE nature, necessity, and utility of ORDER, are among the first impressions we receive from the volume of creation. At the top of every page is inscribed in capitals, legible to every rational eye, "ORDER IS HEAVEN'S FIRST LAW." It is *order* that gives harmony, beauty, and grandeur to the universe. Look we to the brilliant gems that illumine the azure vault of heaven, or to the verdure decked with flowers that carpets the footstool of the Almighty, nothing impresses itself more forcibly upon our observation than the orderly disposition of things in reference to the ultimate designs of perfect wisdom and goodness. Indeed, the idea of order is so constantly and so clearly presented to our minds in all the works and ways of God, that it becomes a rudimental part of all our conceptions of wisdom, power, and goodness—an element of all our thoughts of beauty, excellency, and glory.

The chaotic mass which preoccupied the immense area of the present heavens and earth, as described by Moses, is the best archetype of disorder and confusion which our imagination can sketch. The details of the six days, as delineated by the oldest pen in human annals, is nothing more than the displays of omnipotent arrangement: so that creation itself, as connected with human history, is nothing but the reducing into order the previously discordant elements of things.

In the first and second chapters of Genesis we see the hand of Omnipotence, guided by the counsels of infinite intelligence, separating and arranging the materials of the universe, and erecting, furnishing, and adorning the habitation of man. Could we trace with an angel's eye the delicate touches of that almighty hand which spread out the heavens as a curtain, as they are displayed in the mechanism of the insects of an hour, or the animalculæ that people a drop of water, or build their storehouses in the smallest atoms of the vegetable kingdom; or could we, with an angel's intelligence, survey the whole frame of nature, from the central palace of the universe to its circumference, we cannot doubt but the same order which strikes our

Digitized by Google

eye in all the objects of sense which surround us, would appear every where the supreme law of all these operations, great and small, of that infinite mind which fills the immensity of unbounded space and rejoices in the ceaseless harmonies of eternity.

Aided by the visions of the unseen and eternal world, as furnished us in the apocalyptic parts of the volumes of human redemption, we learn that amongst the celestial hierarchies, principalities, and powers which environ the throne of the Father of eternity, there is an established order as essential to the holiness and bliss of heaven as the arrangements we discover in this portico and outer court of creation, are to the harmony and well being of animated nature.

The patterns of things displayed in the diagramatic tent which Moses pitched at the foot of Sinai, and in the more splendid temple which Solomon reared on Mount Moriah, prospective and allusive to the christian age on earth, and to the economy of the house not built with hands eternal in the heavens, equally proclaim the value and importance of order as essential to the morality, piety, and happiness of man.

Add to all the lessons taught in all the wide dominions of creation, the apostolic precepts addressed to christians, that "all things should be done decently and *in order*," may we not say, that the subject of order, as connected with the happiness and prosperity of the church redeemed by the blood of Jesus, deserves yet, in reference to ourselves, some attention. We shall, therefore, devote a few pages to the consideration of order as connected with the christian institution. Preparatory to the order of the christian church, we shall place the subject in a variety of attitudes before the mind of the reader. In these, however, regard shall be had to his proficiency and usefulness in the christian religion, who has not had the advantage of much reflection on this very essential point.

DEFINITION OF THE TERM.

Order. fully defined, is not simply method, nor simply arrangement, though sometimes so used; but arrangement with reference to design. It is *rational arrangement*. That arrangement may be *rational*, there must be some end in view; and the arrangement must be made in reference to that precise object: therefore, the best order is only another name for the most rational arrangement. As a straight line is the shortest possible distance between any two given points, so the best order is the most direct arrangement to secure any proposed end.

ORDER—*as respects Language.*

All the volumes in our language, and they are innumerable, are composed of twenty-six characters differently arranged. Without arrangement, these letters have no meaning; but arranged according

Digitized by Google

to common consent, they make words, and these words arranged according to established rules of order, make sentences; and these sentences express thoughts. Now as the meaning of language depends wholly upon order, that arrangement of words which most precisely, perspicuously, forcibly, and fully expresses the sense of the speaker, is the best.

ORDER—*as respects the Mind.*

Man has received from his Creator a variety of powers and capacities. He has powers of perception, of reflection, of recollection, of imagination, and of communication. These are called his intellectual powers. Besides these he has a power of volition, called the Will, with certain affections and passions. Whether these are all different acts and emotions of one and the same mind, or different faculties and capacities, is an inquiry unnecessary to our subject; and therefore we speak of them in the most popular style. A well ordered mind is that in which the Will, guided by the understanding, directs all its actions, controls and holds in obedience all the subordinate powers, and extends its jurisdiction not only over its own passions and affections; but over all the appetites, propensities, and members of the body. In a well ordered mind, the Will, aided by the understanding, disciplines even itself and keeps in subordination every power and capacity belonging to man, whether called intellectual or animal.

In every system of nature, as well as in every organized body, whether animal or vegetable, there is one supreme power, to which all the others are by the Creator made subordinate. Thus the Sun is the supreme autocrat of that system which bears his name. The solar system, comprising some thirty planets or more, is governed by the Sun as the supreme head; for although the different planets may control each other to some extent, and even in the aggregate greatly influence the Sun himself; nevertheless, he directs the motions of them all, and his sovereignty is acknowledged by the exact obedience in which they make their ceaseless revolutions round him.

The discipline of the thoughts, or the government of the mind in the acquisition and communication of knowledge, is a matter of immense importance to all who would aim at elevated mental enjoyment, or aspire after great moral usefulness. To call the mind to order is essential to these high advancements. This is done by the standing president, the Will, whose aid is the *attention*, that ministering servant of moral agency. The will commands the attention; the attention commands the powers of perception to their post; then summonses the powers of reflection, memory, imagination, as the case may require, and places judgment over them, who directs their operations. A mind habituated to such an administration in the acquisition and communication of knowledge is in order; and when this is not the case, it is in disorder, and can achieve little or nothing for itself or for others.

Digitized by Google

ORDER—*as respects Discourse.*

The good order or disorder of the mind will appear in all its communications. Those communications which are extemporaneous, as well as those which are premeditated, display the discipline of the mind. And here it may be observed, that a mind well ordered will always be attentive to order in all its communications. Having experienced the advantages of good arrangement in the acquisition of information, it naturally pays homage to method in all its communications that it may facilitate the improvement of others. That order of ideas and sentences which most assists the learner in receiving the instruction designed to be communicated is the best, especially in all didactic discourses. In ascertaining that order, much necessarily depends upon the subject and upon the audience: for that which might be most luminous and convincing on one theme, and in one assembly, might not be so on another subject, and to a different audience.

ORDER—*as respects a Didactic Discourse.*

We have something which we call the *natural* order, and this is always the best if it can only be ascertained. In describing a continent it is more natural to begin with its boundaries than with the products of its soil. In matters of chronology the order of time is the most natural. In historical and biographical sketches time also leads the way. In describing a temple or a palace we do not commence with the rooms nor the furniture, but with its exterior architecture. In relating an adventure we begin with time and place. In describing a tree we begin with the trunk or root, and end with the fruit. All this is natural. But on many subjects the order most natural is not always the most obvious. The best rule in such cases is to seek some analogy between the subject and a familiar object in nature, and then to methodize according to the resemblance.

But in relation to a didactic discourse on some moral or religious doctrine or theme, the order most appropriate is, by a brief and natural exordium or introduction, to prepare the audience for the subject. Then to state the proposition. If illustration it need, next to illustrate it. Then prove or confirm it, if proof it require. Finally, press its moral or religious obligation upon the hearer, by the authority of its truth, and the magnitude of the motives which it suggests.

In arranging the proof, if possible it ought to assume the form of a climax—the weakest argument first—the strongest last. But every thing that is called argument ought *to be* argument. One good argument, indeed, is enough to prove any point. Two or three good witnesses in a question of fact is always desirable. It is, moreover, expedient that illustrations, arguments, and witnesses be so distinct as to be arranged numerically, and that they be always referred to as first, second, third, &c. This, good order peremptorily demands.

Digitized by Google

ORDER—*as respects Exhortation.*

A teacher and an exhorter may sometimes be found in the same person; but they are not the same office, nor the same work. The establishment and the development of truth is the work of the teachers; but the motives to duty are the rhetoric of the exhorters. An exhorter selects some duty as the burthen of his exhortation. In urging it he arranges his motives as the logician does his proofs. A *preacher* proclaims *facts* and proves them by *witnesses*; a *teacher* ascertains and developes *truth*, and supports it by *arguments;* an *exhorter* selects *duties*, and recommends and enforces them by *motives*. The gifts for each are as distinct as the works to be performed; but the order of the address of the preacher, the discourse of the teacher, and the exhortation of the exhorter is essentially the same as regards the parts and distributions of their respective compositions, or speeches. It would save millions of words per annum, if public speakers would arrange their illustrations and arguments numerically, make and keep them distinct, and always be silent when they are done. It would greatly enhance the value of their public services if they would always have some point or points in view when they arise to speak. This would relieve them from the awkward position of having to speak half an hour to find something to say. Moreover, what they say would leave a much more abiding impression on their audience if it were said methodically and perspicuously, and with the dignity and gravity which comport with the sanctions and solemnity of the tidings or message which they declare.

Concerning the general order of all religious instructions and exhortations, it should be distinctly remembered that facts are first to be stated, illustrated, and proved concerning the apostacy of mankind; that these facts are to be proved by *testimony*, which testimony may be illustrated and commended by our reasonings on things that are now existing; that the gospel is also founded on facts, which are also to be clearly propounded, fully illustrated and logically proved; that of these facts the chief are, that Jesus the Nazarene was the true and long promised Messiah; that he died for our sins, was buried and rose again the third day; that the persuasion of the truth of these facts is the christian belief, or faith, which must precede all true repentance and genuine reformation of life: for how shall men repent of sins of which they are ignorant; or trust in a Saviour, or love and obey a person of whom they believe nothing! This order is founded in nature or the necessity of things. After these facts and their meaning are fully and methodically laid before an audience, then are the premises laid from which motives are furnished to the exhorter to persuade, beseech, and urge to the duty of obedience. So proceeded the Apostles—"With many words Peter *testified*, then *exhorted*."* This was the order of their preachings and teachings, and it should be

* *Acts* ii. 40.

Digitized by Google

the order of our public addresses. The preacher and the teacher should always be followed by the exhorter; for all faith and knowledge are for corresponding practice.

ORDER—*as respects Prayer.*

If there be comeliness, decency, and order in arranging our addresses to man, there certainly ought to be decency and order in our addresses to our heavenly Father. The Messiah thought it expedient to teach his disciples how they ought to address their Father in heaven. The *manner* was as admirable as the matter of that model which he gave them during his earthly ministry. Paul, moreover, would have christians pray with a reference to the understanding of others, as well as to pray in spirit. "I will pray with my spirit and with understanding also," said the Apostle; "so that my understanding may be fruitful." We ought, in the language of Job, so "to order our cause before him" as that we might expect a gracious audience in heaven, and an intelligible audience by those who should say *amen* to our social petitions. We should not only accustom ourselves to the most humble and reverential style in our prayers to God, but also so to order our adorations, thanksgivings, praises, confessions, and petitions, not only to avoid all unbecoming repetitions and unmeaning words, but also to edify and comfort those who bow with us before the Majesty of Heaven. Rapidity in utterance is as unbecoming as idle repetitions or too great familiarity of expression. In the words of Solomon, we ought not to "be hasty to utter any word before God: for God is in heaven and we upon earth; therefore, let our words be few." Too frequent use of the divine name, and a fondness for unscriptural epithets in our addresses to God, are among the very common demonstrations of the influence of the still existing apostacy. When christians attend more to the models and directions of Apostles and Prophets in their adddresses to God, and less to the customs of a degenerate race of professors, they will not mingle petitions and thanksgivings in the same breath—they will not vociferate with the rapidity of a school-boy—neither will they multiply pompous words, with frequent invocations of the divine name, as if to round off a period, or to finish a sentence; but will, with humility, reverence, and profound awe, and with the utmost deliberation, make known their requests to God; and when they have expressed the unfeigned and ardent desires of their souls to God, they will not continue to repeat again and again the same petitions in some new or altered forms of speech, for the too apparent or seeming purpose of either acquiring praise of men or pleasing them at the hazard of offending our Father and our God.

To sit down and address God, as is very common at most family tables, in their thanksgivings for God's daily bounties, is most indecorous and disorderly. This, unless in cases of great physical debility, is not to glorify God with our bodies. Shall a man arise to address a respectable friend, and sit down to thank God for his daily

Digitized by Google

repasts! Good order will never sanction so indecorous a usage. Much less in the public congregation is it comely for those who unite in public worship to keep their seats when they presume to address that eternal throne, around which the angels of God prostrate themselves in token of their profound reverence.

To stand erect, and lift up holy hands—or to bow the knee before the Lord Almighty—or to prostrate oneself upon the earth, the foot-stool of Divine Mercy, is sanctioned by the examples of the great, and wise, and good of all dispensations. Solomon in the climax of his glory fell upon his knees before the Lord. Jesus fell upon his face, or stood erect upon the earth, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, when addressing his petitions to the throne of his Father. And shall we, in imitation of them whose customs are borrowed from a degenerate and apostate age, continue a practice, so unprecedented amongst the saints of all ages, and so repugnant to the fundamental principles of christian decency and good order!

ORDER—*as respects Domestic Happiness.*

The order of a well regulated family, more than any other earthly institution, greatly, though not in all respects, resembles the order of God's house. The members of the church are styled "sons and daughters" of the Lord Almighty—"brethren" and "sisters" in Jesus Christ. The church is called "the house of God." A man's "ruling well his own house" is the best preparation for ruling the house of God. "The family of God on earth," and "the household of faith," are descriptive names of the whole church of God. But at present we speak of a human family.

The politician and the christian alike declare that to the good order of the family, the church and state are most indebted for their best citizens. Where a family is brought up in good order, and the spirit of subordination infused in infancy, the rudimental traits of the good citizen and the orderly christian, so early implanted, seldom fail of full development in manhood and mature age. But, on the contrary, if under the paternal roof there is wanting discipline and good order, the precepts of christianity and the sound maxims of political government meet with so much resistance in early habits as seldom to form characters of the first order. Much, then—nay, almost every thing, depends upon good order in the family institution.

By an ordinance of Heaven the father of the household is, under God, absolute monarch; the mother, next in authority, is always second in command; and, in the absence of the father, governess in chief. We need not allude to the familiar details of household business in proof of the necessity of time and place for every thing, and every thing in its proper time and place. These matters are duly appreciated by our readers. But the moral and religious discipline of the family is not unworthy of a passing remark. In a well regulated family the fear and love of God are not only daily acknowledged, but habitually inculcated from the very dawn of reason, and the first

Digitized by Google

feelings of responsibility and obligation. Hence the Apostles, as well as Moses the great lawgiver, thought it not unworthy of their attention to command parents to bring up their children in the correction and instruction of the Lord. And so it has always been, that "the voice of rejoicing and of salvation is in the tabernacles of the righteous."* The men of high renown among the saints of God in the most ancient times, reared their altars to the Lord in presence of their households wherever they pitched their tents.

For our part we cannot see how christian parents can bring up their children in the correction and instruction of the Lord, while they neglect morning and evening to worship God in their presence, and read and expound to them the words of eternal life. The restraints of the Bible are the proper restraints and the only suitable restraints for the moral culture and religious education of children. Not to use these, is to refuse God's own means of raising up children to himself. "From a child," says Paul to Timothy, "you have known the Holy Scriptures, able to make you wise to salvation," adding only to the ancient writings "the faith which is in Christ Jesus." The best encomium he could pronounce upon the order of the families of his progenitors, was, that "the unfeigned faith that dwelt in Timothy first dwelt in his grand-mother Lois, then in his mother Eunice," and finally in himself.

In a well ordered household the children are subordinate not only to their parents, but to one another, according to age. The first born is respected by all the family—the second, next—and so on to the infant, who naturally looks up with respect to his senior brother. It is indecorous to treat a senior brother as a junior, as it is disorderly for the first born irrespectfully to address his father or his mother. Superior age always commands respect, and this respect, though it continue not, should always begin at home.

A family thus trained and disciplined from the nursery to manhood, will seldom fail to be prosperous and happy: for the end of good order is prosperity and happiness. Precept without example is much less efficacious than example without precept. Children are naturally imitative, and therefore precepts contradicted by example can achieve little or nothing. The wisest and the best parents are those who begin by times rationally, morally, and religiously to train their children. The junior members of a family will look up to the seniors as naturally as to their parents, and if the elder branches are disciplined to grow to the skies, the younger branches will seldom incline to the earth. But almost as certain as the law of gravity, "*as the twig is bent the tree's inclin'd.*"

If the sons and daughters of sages and philosophers have not often attained the fame and standing of their progenitors, we seldom meet with distinguished piety that dwelt not first in a mother or a father. While we seldom meet with hereditary greatness, we as seldom meet with distinguished goodness which is not in part, at least,

---

* *Psalm* cxviii. 15.

Digitized by Google

hereditary. Thus God, in the righteous and merciful administration of his government over human destiny, has so arranged cause and effect as to commend and enforce the value of good order in the domestic circle.

What higher or holier ambition can impel the actions of a parent than to train his children for God and heaven! And for his encouragement in the grand arrangements of the moral empire, it so happens that there is not within the power of parents any object more attainable for their offspring than heaven. They cannot make them rich, or learned, or great, so easily as they may make them moral and religious, under the blissful and gracious economy of salvation. It has, indeed, been often observed that when christian parents order their households well, that whatever need there may be for a teacher of the doctrine of the Bible, there is no need for a preacher of the gospel. But if professing parents fail to dedicate their offspring to the Lord, and then to train them for immortality, the after chances for their salvation are always less than those of the children of non-professors. They having seen in their parents the form of religion without its power, have less regard for its hopes and its fears than they who every day have not been disgusted with the contradictions between the profession and the lives of their parents.

The good order of a family, then, as respects the moral and religious training of children and servants, is one of the most powerful means of salvation, of purity, and happiness which God has vouchsafed to man.* The business of every day in such a family will always make room for the most interesting of all duties, the most useful and honorable of all employments—that of preaching and teaching Christ by reading and expounding to the young the sacred writings, and by invoking the favors of Heaven upon all their undertakings, and in acknowledging the goodness of the Lord bestowed in a thousand channels. Thus, and thus most naturally, will the infant mind be imbued with the fear of God and reverence for the Saviour of mankind. In their turn their offspring will arise and call their parents blessed; for the endearments of parental piety and its faithful and affectionate attentions are never forgotten. A mother's love is only surpassed by a mother's piety in holding fast its dominion over the understanding, the conscience, and the affections of her children.

ORDER—*as respects the Church.*

OF THE FORMATION OF A CHURCH.

The materials for a church or congregation of christians must, in the necessity of things, exist before a church can be formed. We have the stones quarried before we put them together in the house. The Lord's house is built of living stones closely laid together and well cemented. Figure apart: the materials for a church are re-

* *See "Christian Baptist,"* vol. 1, page 200.

Digitized by Google

generated men and women—disciples of Christ. By regenerated persons we mean those born of water and Spirit—those who, believing that Jesus is the Son of God on the proper evidence, the witness of the Spirit, penitent for their sins, understanding his blood as the only procuring cause of remission, and determined to obey the Lord in all things according to his word; such persons having confessed the Lord by being immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, according to his commandment, are the proper materials for the congregation of the Lord.

But the simple existence of such persons, or their being thrown together by accident, does not make them a church or house of God. There is some form of coming together as a church. There must be an agreement expressed in some way. They pledge themselves to one another in the name of the Lord, that they will walk together as becometh saints in the relation of a christian congregation.

How this shall be done, or in what *form*, is not prescribed in the way of a positive statute or by special formalities. It is enough that *they give themselves to one another* by some token or pledge—"*the right hand of fellowship*," or some such significant action, the unequivocal token of accord.

Forms, however, are not to be dispensed with; for every thing that is done must be done in some form; and a becoming form is preferable to an unbecoming or insignificant form. Joshua set up a stone under an oak as a witness that the people agreed to serve the Lord. This was better than no witness, or he would not have adopted it. Forms are not without their use. It is to be presumed that every Jew who for forty years afterwards looked at that stone, would remember that Joshua said when he set it up, "This stone shall be a witness unto us; for it hath heard all the words of the Lord which he spake to us: it shall therefore be a witness to you lest you deny your God."

Because we have forms without the thing signified, "the form of godliness without the power," some object to all forms as of no value. This is an error. We may have the form of religion without the power; but we cannot have the power without the form. Shall we not "lift up holy hands," or "bow the knee," or give "the right hand of fellowship," because these are but forms, and forms which have been abused and are susceptible of abuse? The giving of the right hand as a pledge of a covenant or of friendship, is one of the most natural, most ancient, and most common forms in existence. Locke says it was not only the sign of accord among the Jews, but among all the Gentiles. The Apostles themselves, in Jerusalem, used this form; and as a token of accord gave to Paul and Barnabas the *right hands* of fellowship—not one, but all of them gave their right hands to these two, in sign of their fellowship with the gospel which they preached among the Gentiles, and with them as proclaimers of it.

Nothing is more comely than when a number of unassociated disciples agree to come together, and to be built together as a church, having heartily and fully expressed their determination to walk

Digitized by Google

together under the Lord, that in token of their determination they give to each other the right hand, and make it a matter of record. In separating themselves from all others, and in giving themselves to one another in the Lord under the New Constitution, the more emphatically, significantly, and solemnly it is done, the better. And should they call others to witness their solemn covenant, it may not be regarded as an unmeaning ceremony; nay, should "they subscribe it with their hands," as did the Jews, who, under the guidance of the reformers Ezra and Nehemiah, resolved to unite in the covenant of their God, no man could condemn them. The names of the signers are yet attached to that covenant, and to the honor of those renowned names their signatures are preserved to this day.*

Speaking probably with this in his eye, and prospectively of gospel times, Isaiah says, "One shall say, I am the Lord's; another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall *subscribe with his hand unto the Lord*, and surname himself by the name of Israel."† Should any society subscribe with their hands to the Lord to walk by the New Institution, as well as give to each other the pledge of the right hand of fellowship, no person could condemn them from Old Testament or New. The more solemnly and impressively christians come together as a church, and the more significantly and devoutly they receive members into their community the better. We need these helps to our steadfastness, as much as we need to "lift up holy hands," or to "bow the knee," or to speak with earnestness in our prayers in order to quicken and animate our devotion.

ORGANIZATION OF A CHURCH.

When a society of disciples agree thus to walk as christians under the New Testament, solemnly adopted as the rule of their piety and morality, they are not organized as a body having all the officers necessary to their furtherance in the faith, and growth in the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Redeemer. They need bishops and deacons; but it may happen that in the mean time they have no persons qualified for these highly useful and responsible offices; yet they must go forward and grow in the knowledge and favor of the Lord. In order to be useful to the most feeble band who have thus come together, we shall suppose ourselves called to counsel those who have just entered into the covenant, and have yet no persons approved to place over them in the Lord.

There are but two cases supposable, because there are but two distinct cases which have as yet occurred. The one is a church composed of disciples who have come together without the intervention of any preacher or teacher—persons who may have migrated far from the place in which they were first converted, or who may have been brought to a knowledge and belief of the truth without any other creed than the Bible. The other is the case of those who have

* *Nehemiah* ix. 38. x. i. † Isaiah xliv. 5.

Digitized by Google

been recently illuminated by the instrumentality of a preacher, by whose labors in their neighborhood they have been translated into the kingdom of God's beloved Son. In the latter case he should labor among them till they are able to make a scriptural selection from among themselves. But the former case presents the greater difficulty, and to it we shall more particularly attend.

It is obvious that churches were found in the age of the Apostles that were *incomplete;* still they were churches of Christ, and enjoyed some of the ordinances without the full order of a church. Had this not been the case Paul could not have left Titus in Crete "*to set in order the things wanting*, and to ordain elders in every city." Even in christian communities that had all the ordinances of the Apostles there were some more exemplary than others in all the excellencies of good order.

Now as in the nature of things there is the infancy of a community as well as its manhood, so is it in every particular church of Christ. In the case before us we have an infant church, like an infant family, without an experienced oversight. Some person must either assume the temporary management of its affairs, or be appointed to officiate for the time being. There cannot be any debate in deciding whether this responsibility ought to be granted or assumed. All will agree, in theory at least, that it ought to be granted by the voice of the community, and not assumed by any individual or individuals. Numerous and great must be the misfortunes of any community who give themselves up to the assumption of any of its members. The best qualified are always the most modest and backward; while those least qualified to preside or to lead, push themselves forward. If, then, the brethren will not give their voice in favor of those they judge best qualified, they must give themselves up into the hands of an individual more zealous than intelligent, more confident than modest, or more conceited than wise in the affairs of the kingdom of heaven.

Good order in such a case requires that some persons, and those of the best attainments, and the best character, should be elected, for the time being, to go forward in social worship and in the edification and discipline of the infant flock. The New Testament, indeed, requires this: for the Apostles would not consent to the ordination of a novice, nor of one who has not been first *proved* to be competent to the duties assigned bishops and deacons

It is disorderly, in the fullest sense of the word, for any person to assume any thing in an organized community. *The voice of the church must be distinctly heard before any person can be acceptably heard by it.* It is conceded that in a called or accidental meeting of citizens of any country, or of Christ's kingdom, some person must move an organization, or call the assembly to order, anterior to their action on any subject. But so soon as they are organized no person can open his lips but by permission of the assembly, through its approved organs. And be it observed with emphasis, once for all, *that whatever is disorderly in any community is always disorderly in the church of God;* for the house of God necessarily is, and ought always to be the most orderly assembly on earth.

Digitized by Google

When, then, a church is formed, and persons appointed to preside over it, every one that prays, sings, exhorts, speaks, or performs any service in, or for the church, does it by permission, request, or appointment of the brotherhood, through the person or persons whom they have appointed to administer the affairs of the congregation. And whoever speaks or acts in, or for the community, without such request, permission, or appointment, acts out of order, and despises the whole congregation; for he that dishonors the overseers of the congregation, dishonors the congregation that has called him to this office, though it were but for a single meeting.

So long, then, as in every community there are some more advanced in knowledge, experience, and years, than others, and so long as every christian community has the living oracles—the writings and teachings of Apostles and Prophets—there is not a case likely to happen, in which it will be lawful to forsake the assembling of themselves together for all the acts of social worship, and all the means of edification and consolation in the truth, because of the want of officers or persons to serve them in any capacity. If they are all such perfect babes in Christ—*infants*, unable to speak a single word to edification, let them *read*, and sing, and pray, and commemorate the Saviour's death, with the Book in their hands, under the presidency of the oldest infants in the Lord among them. The senior infants, chosen and appointed to lead the way, are, to them, elders and overseers in the Lord.

It is true that this is supposing an extreme case, merely to test a principle, or its universality; yet in this extreme case the rule will work well: for if the church is composed of such very babes, they will not require learned men to instruct them. One that is a few days in advance will be relatively a senior among them and fit to assist them in the Lord.

"Experience is a good teacher," and "Practice makes perfect," are maxims of the most catholic orthodoxy. If, then, there is not wanting devotion to the Lord, there will be a very discernible proficiency in a short time; and their infant church will soon advance under the wholesome doctrine which is according to godliness, not only in age, but in strength. They will grow in favor as they grow in knowledge, and they will advance in usefulness in the ratio of their unfeigned devotion to the Lord. Still there is no surrendering any principle of the christian institution in the case before us. As we have the man in the infant, so have we in this arrangement *the church of Christ*, with its officers, growing up to manhood.

There is no wild democracy, no despotic papacy, no self-created ministry, no *lay* administration of ordinances in this economy. It is, however, an *infant* church, and it ought soon to learn to speak for Christ, by the eloquence of both word and action, suiting the action to the word, and the word to the occasion.

Generally it happens in the present time, as it did in the age of the Apostles,—most new congregations are gathered by the labors of some evangelist. In such cases it becomes his duty not only to im-

Digitized by Google

merse them on confession of their faith, but also to teach them how they ought to walk and please the Lord in all things, by directing their attention to the Apostles' doctrine, or to such portions of it as apply to their circumstances. But constitutionally it is they themselves, and not he that chooses for them their officers.

ORDER—*as respects the Ordination of Bishops.*

The right to officiate in any office in the christian church being derived from the head of the church alone, we must regard all constitutional officers as acting under the authority, as well as by the direction of the Great King.

The long debated question about the *jus divinum*, or divine right of bishops, deacons, and their ordination, we promise not to discuss in this essay, farther than a passing remark. This much of the question only falls within our present object,—Whether is the right to ordain derived directly from the Lord to the church; or indirectly through a long succession of ordained persons, in an unbroken series, from the Apostles.

The great majority of christendom, Catholic and Protestant, are on the side of an *order of bishops in succession* from the Apostles, with the right to ordain vested in them by the head of the church. Their model is the Levitical Priesthood. The order of Aaron and the order of Peter are, with the majority, the same sort of an institution, only with the exception of flesh and blood lineage. Their views make the priesthood an order distinct from the church, though acknowledged to belong to it and to be a component part it.

The right to ordain is, then, in popular esteem, a right vested in *an order of men* now of eighteen hundred years continuance, transmitted through many hands; and is, therefore, to us, indirect from Jesus Christ. We, however, from many reasons, are constrained to reject the idea of *an elect order in succession* in the christian church, possessing vested rights, derived not from the community as such, but from Jesus Christ, through a distinct class in the community, as essentially papistical in its tendency, and contrary to the letter and spirit of the christian institution.

We expect not to find the living among the dead. We seek not authority in the church from an order distinct from the church, so liable to deterioration and abuse as what is usually called "the christian priesthood." Authority from the head of the church is much more direct than that claimed by Rome, England, and Scotland. *Theirs has passed through many hands, polluted with the blood of saints and martyrs.*

There is not a sectarian bishop on this continent, call him Episcopal, Presbyterial, Baptist, or Methodist, who pretends to trace his descent from the Apostles, through Roman, English, or Scotch bishops, who, in passing up the stream of his authority, through the times of Papistical and Protestant supremacy, can find one line of clean hands, pure from the blood of the confessors of the Lord Jesus. If the

Digitized by Google

hands that consecrated him are not dripping with the blood of those crying from under the celestial altar for vengeance on their murderers, it is impossible for him to show that those who laid their hands upon his predecessors were not stained with that blood; for the bishops of the Man of Sin are crimsoned from head to foot with the blood of slain millions, who, but for them and their orders, would not have given their lives rather than deny their Lord or pollute their own consciences.

Has the Lord Jesus, then, left his church and people to seek for authority to preach, teach, and administer ordinances from the hands of his worst enemies! or has the grace of ordination descended to us, pure and uncorrupt, through hearts and hands stained with christian blood! It cannot be. We must look for authority from the Lord more direct and less liable to deterioration than that of which many Catholics and Protestants make their boast.

These things premised, we hasten to state and answer the following questions:—

1st. *What is ordination* as respects the christian church?

It is the solemn election and appointment of persons to the oversight and service of a christian community. To ordain is to appoint; and all appointments, from that of a successor to Judas as a witness of the resurrection, from an apostle to the messenger of a church, or an almoner, was in the beginning *by an election of the whole community.**

But there must be some form of setting persons apart to the work, or of inducting them into the office to which they have been elected. This is self-evident. It must be done after some form. Still we must distinguish between the election or appointment and the mode of consecration or induction. The election or choice of the community, guided in that choice by the Living Oracles, is the essential consideration, without which all forms would be unavailing. VOX POPULI VOX DEI, or, in English, "the voice of the people" is, in this case, "the voice of God," calling the persons elect to the work of the Lord.

To comprehend the meaning of the form it is necessary to regard the ordination throughout in the light of a covenant, or an agreement between the congregation that elects and the persons elected.

I say, a *covenant;* for, in truth, a solemn compact it is. The items of agreement are these:—The electors, persuaded that no society can exist comfortably without government, or the exercise of authority; that what is every person's business is no person's business; and that every society, as much as every family, has its own proper business; that the congregation, as a whole, sustains a certain relation to the world as well as that subsisting among the members themselves; that she owes many duties to her own members and to the world, which she cannot discharge faithfully and effectually in the aggregate, or as a community, but by persons authorized and directed by her to act for her and in her name—stipulates and agrees with A, B, and C,

* *Acts* i. 23. vi. 3, 5. 2 Cor. viii. 19.

Digitized by Google

whom she has proved to be qualified by the Holy Spirit for rendering those services to the church, that they devote themselves to the work of bishops or deacons, as the case may be; and in consideration of their submitting and devoting themselves to the exercise of those functions from a ready mind, she agrees to submit to them in the Lord, and to sustain them in all respects, so far as she has ability and they require her aids.

Such, in substance, though not in all its details, is the understanding, agreement, or compact between the electors and the elected; and on this understanding they proceed to ordination, or the consecration of those persons to the work assigned them.

Such being the agreement, in virtue of which the forms of ordination are called for, it follows that the forms themselves must in some way correspond with the thing signified, and necessarily the parties themselves, and not a distinct order, are to take part: *for the covenant is between the electors and the elected, and not between the elected and a distinct order of men.* The corollary from these premises is, that THE CONGREGATION HERSELF ELECTS AND ORDAINS ALL HER OFFICERS.

No person can take any part in these forms of consecration or separation to the work of the Lord, but only so far as they are regarded as members of the congregation, and to be under the authority of those whom they invest with office, or to give direction to them as servants of the congregation.*

2. What, then, may we ask in the second place, are the forms of ordination? The answer is at hand—Imposition of hands, accompanied with fasting and prayer. Thus have persons been consecrated to sacred offices in the christian church from the beginning. And, indeed, since ever there was an *organized assembly* of worshippers on earth, the forms of ordination to office have been substantially the same: so far at least, that 'holy hands' have universally been laid upon the heads of those invested with sacred offices.

3. The third question is still more interesting because of the crisis in which we live, and to it more attention must be paid. It is this:—*Who may, or who ought, to lay hands on the bishops, or deacons, or messengers elect?*

I answer, without dubiety, and in a few words, The community, the whole community, or such elders of the community as may be approved in behalf of the congregation. I am fully aware of the objections which will arise in many minds to such an unqualified declaration. We cannot argue the question here; but we dare not leave it with a simple assertion, and shall therefore suggest some reasons for the answer given:—

1st. The nature of the understanding or covenant between the electors and the elected, and of the authority to be delegated to the elected by the electors, demands that they who give the power, or the grace, or the office, should *give it with their own hands*, and not by

* *Why the Apostles laid hands in the ordination of bishops or deacons, may appear more evident in the sequel.*

Digitized by Google

proxy. Imposition of hands in the act of ordination is simply the conferring of office, or devoting a person to the work of the Lord; and therefore all that is decent and comely requires that those who give the office give it with their own hands.

2d. Besides it is most dignified on the part of the elected to receive the office from those to whom they are to minister, than from any foreign order of men. To receive a crown from a foreign prince is always indicative of vassalage on the part of the prince who receives it to him who confers it. To be ordained by the hands of those without the congregation that confers the honor, is dishonorable to both parties—the bishops elect, and the electors. It argues subordination and vassalage in both the bishops and their flocks to those foreigners who impose their hands in ordination.

3d. "Without all contradiction," says Paul, "the less is blessed by the superior." If, then, the bishops and deacons are *servants* of the church, and if the conferring of office be a blessing or an honor to them who receive it, the church being superior to them that serve, it is most apposite that the congregation impose hands, than that a class of public servants, the equals of the elect, should do it.

4th. But more authoritative than all, when sacred office became necessary in God's first congregation, he commanded the multitude, and not Moses nor Aaron, to impose hands on the heads of those who were to be devoted to the service of the congregation. Be it, then, distinctly observed, that those now called THE LAITY by the Man of Sin, and those accustomed to his style, were commanded by God to consecrate the Levites and to devote them to the service of the tabernacle of the Lord. Hence ordination began with the common people. Let the reader who is sceptical turn over to the book of Numbers, chapter viii. 9th and 10th verses: "And thou shalt bring the Levites before the tabernacle of the congregation, and thou shalt gather the whole assembly of the children of Israel together, and thou shalt bring the Levites before the Lord, *and the children of Israel shall put their hands upon the Levites.* And Aaron shall offer the Levites before the Lord for an offering of the children of Israel that they may execute the service of the Lord." It is, I believe, universally agreed that the whole 600,000 militia of Israel could not impose their hands upon 22,000 Levites; but that the heads of the people, the representatives of all the tribes, for and in behalf of all the congregation, and in the presence of the whole assembly, did actually put their hands upon the heads of the Levites. But however this may be agreed upon, one thing is certain, that those who first imposed hands were the community who had never hands imposed on themselves.

5th. In the last place here: The idea of superiority of power in those who ordain, above the community, is without countenance in the New Testament. Nay, the contrary is taught; for when the Apostles Paul and Barnabas were sojourners and members of the congregation in Antioch—at the suggestion of the Holy Spirit, the prophets and teachers, with the concurrence of the whole congregation, certainly inferior in dignity to the great Apostle to the Gentiles,

Digitized by Google

laid hands on Paul and Barnabas and consecrated them to the work assigned them by the great head of the church.*

From this imposition of hands we learn, 1st. That hands were imposed not always for conferring spiritual gifts, even in the days of the Apostles; but for devoting and separating persons to the work of the Lord. 2d. That persons of inferior standing in point of office laid the hands of ordination on those who were their superiors in gifts and abilities, as well as in general standing in the estimation of the brethren. 3. That imposition of hands was essential to ordination, accompanied with prayer and fasting; and 4th. That no excellence in the gifts of preaching, teaching, or of administering the affairs of the family of God; that no call or qualification on the part of Heaven, however clear and unequivocal, was allowed in the primitive church to dispense with these sacred forms of ordination.

It may not be out of order to observe, that if every particular congregation thus elect and ordain its officers by the authority of the Lord, and according to the suggestions of the Holy Spirit, then, in that case, the right and authority of such officers to administer the affairs of the church is directly derived, not by succession, through ignorant and blood-stained hands, but directly from heaven. To such elders it may in truth be said, "Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock over which *the Holy Spirit* has constituted you bishops."†

In such a case there is no need to go out of the particular congregation to search the rolls and moth-eaten registers of an order of clergy pretending to lineal official descent from Peter, through more than three hundred popes and their clergy; which, by the way, would be on the popular hypothesis essential to the confidence of the church in the legitimacy of their succession.

In this case the church has only to consult the sacred scriptures, and to see that the persons whom they elect are those pointed out by the Holy Spirit speaking in the Apostles. They have to take heed that they are duly elected by the voice of the congregation, and that they are devoted to the Lord by the imposition of their hands, with prayer to God and fasting. Then have they an assurance that they have a divinely authorized ministry, to which it is their duty, their honor, and their happiness to submit themselves as to those who are responsible to Jesus Christ and to them for the faithful performance of the duties of their office. To them they are, in duty bound, to submit as "to them that watch for their souls," under the solemn responsibility of "giving an account to the Lord"—"that they may do it with joy and not with sorrowing;" for that would be to their eternal detriment and dishonor.

Against all this we anticipate that it will be repeated the ten thouthousandth time, that the Apostles *alone* laid hands on those elected by the congregation. But this cannot be sustained: for the elders of a congregation laid their hands upon the head of Timothy‡—for the

---

* *For a more full and argumentative development on the whole subject of ordination, the reader will please examine the whole series of my letters to Dr. Otey of Tennessee, now in progress.* † *Acts xx.* 28. ‡ *1 Tim. iv.* 14.

distinguished members of the church of Antioch laid their hands upon the head of the missionaries Paul and Barnabas*—as in the antecedent house of God the elders of the whole congregation, or persons deputed by the community, who had never hands imposed on them, laid their hands upon the Levites.

And even should it be still argued that it was most usual for the Apostles to lay on their hands, a question arises, which, when fairly settled, nullifies the papistical argument deduced therefrom: for it can be argued, and argued triumphantly, that the Apostles, not by virtue of apostleship, but because *elders* in the congregation of Jerusalem, laid hands on the deacons elect; and as *elders* in other congregations which they planted or watered, assisted in the consecration of those appointed by the churches, by and with the advice, and according to the direction of the Apostles, that persons are nominated, elected, and ordained.

If the Apostle Paul could, with propriety, while absent in the body, say that he acted with the Corinthians in the exercise of discipline, may it not in the same license be said, that "though absent in the body, yet present in spirit," or by his will, he acts with the church in executing the orders which he gave†

To be still more explicit and copious on this long debated topic, we would add, that when a church is once arrived at manhood, having its bishops and deacons—that when any person is elected by the congregation to fill any vacancy, by death or resignation, then indeed the congregation will most naturally act through its own elders in laying on hands on the newly elected bishop. And is not this the reason, and a good reason why the Apostles, who were always the *elders*‡ in every church where they sojourned, took so active a part in the imposition of hands on the bishops and deacons elect.

He that concludes that ordination is a part of the apostleship, must, to be consistent, plead that the eldership and diaconate are parts of the apostolic office; for the Apostles acted as elders and deacons in some churches. They all attended upon tables in Jerusalem before persons were elected to those duties; and Peter exhorts elders because he says himself is one; and consequently it was in good order for him as a bishop, and a senior bishop, to exhort not only the christian community, but the elders that presided over them. And be it observed, that he addresses the elders as pastors or shepherds, feeding the flock of God under the supervision of the great, the chief Shepherd and Bishop of souls. The only divinely authorized Archbishop is, then, "the chief Shepherd" of God's flock, the Lord Jesus, who "purchased the flock with his own blood."

There is a reason for the frequency of allusion to the imposition of the Apostles' hands, which merits our notice. They were entrusted with the erection of the kingdom of the Messiah in the world. This threw into their hands every sort of office and duty. They preached first, they taught first—they first exhorted—first waited upon the

---

* *Acts* xiii. 3. † 1 *Cor.* iii. ‡ 1 *Peter* v. 1.

Digitized by Google

tables of the poor—were the first deacons and the first bishops of the churches which they planted. They appointed persons, such as Timothy, Titus, and others, to assist them in getting things in order. But that they had successors in this character is insusceptible of proof, from all that is on sacred record. Many things they taught by word, and many things by letter. Their traditions by word are sometimes alluded to; and when learned are as obligatory as what is written. They are, however, only found in an authoritative form in their epistles still extant.

One thing is most obvious: they never appointed bishops over two or more churches; but so soon as it was expedient ordained *bishops* in *every* city—*elders* in *every* church. Hence we read of the *elders*, or *bishops*, (for these words are used interchangeably) of the church in Ephesus of the church in Jerusalem —of elders ordained in every church; *but never of one bishop over two churches.*

Are we not now prepared to state the order of ordination?

1 The congregation, after having proved the abilities and capacities to teach and rule found in its own members, and, above all, tested their character as approved by those within and without the congregation, appoints a day for the election of its proper officers.

2. Having agreed upon those eligible, possessing in an acceptable measure the qualifications commanded by the Apostles, a day is appointed for their solemn consecration to the Lord.

3. The day arrives; the church assemble with fasting, and proceeds to select members to impose hands on the officers elect in behalf of the congregation.

The persons thus chosen then proceed to impose their hands on the heads of those elected, while all unite in prayer to God that those brethren chosen by them, and now devoted to the Lord as their bishops or deacons, may, feeling their responsibility, with all diligence and fidelity to the Lord, and with all humility of mind and affectionate concern for the brotherhood, exercise the office with which they are hereby invested in the name of the Lord, according to the true intent and meaning of the christian institution, as they shall account to the Lord at his glorious appearing and kingdom. The whole congregation then lifting up their voice, say, *Amen!*

Whether this may include all the solemnities of such an occasion, may, perhaps, be questioned by some; but that it does not transcend all that is taught and implied in the ancient order of ordination, cannot, we think, be doubted by any one intelligent in the Oracles of God. It will be remembered that we are writing in reference to a new church—to a congregation coming into the apostolic order; for after being once set in order, it will be unnecessary to select persons to ordain or to introduce other seniors into a participation of the oversight or ministry of the community. Those already ordained will for the brotherhood always act in such matters. They are the standing presbytery or senate of the congregation.

It was, however, expedient, in our judgment, to select the most difficult case, and one that will place the true fountain of all official authority in the boldest relief before the brotherhood.

Digitized by Google

No one can say that such officers, so nominated, elected, and ordained by the people, have not full ecclesiastic authority and right to officiate in behalf of the congregation, because they are of their own choice and ordination. Neither can it be said with a due regard to what is written by the Apostles, that such officers have not the authority of the head of the church, as well as of the brethren, to administer the affairs of the congregation; for they are of the Lord's choice and ordination. They are persons chosen by the Lord and the people. They are ordained by the Lord and the people; because the laws of the Lord are consulted and obeyed in the whole affair by the people.

The jurisdiction of such bishops is always circumscribed by the congregation which ordained them. A single church is the largest diocess known in the New Testament. Neither does his election and ordination give him an indelible character, nor a perpetual office. Should he leave the church, which, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, created him, and become a member of another church, he enters it as a private member, and so continues until that church elect and ordain him, should they call for his services. The bishops and deacons of the church in Philippi were the bishops and deacons of the church in Philippi, and of no other church; and so of Ephesus, Antioch, Rome and Jerusalem.

Of the bishops of a large congregation it will generally, perhaps always, happen that one of them will be eminent above the others. Character, age, talent, information, will inevitably bestow superiority in some respects. Although all the presbyters or eldership are equal in authority, some one will occasionally be president of the meeting; and, perhaps, one may become standing president. This is inevitable. Although all the Apostles were equal in authority, among them there were some called *pillars;* and of these one was more influential than the others. Among the first twelve Peter, James, and John were regarded by the whole christian community as "*pillars*" of high reputation. In the great meeting in Jerusalem, when Paul and Silas went as delegates from the church in Antioch, in behalf of the Syrian christians; and when a general meeting was called of all the apostles, elders, and the whole congregation; and after there had been "*much debate,*" Peter and James spoke once, and all were silent. The weight of their judgment settled the controversy. Paul became chief of all the Apostles, not in church authority, but in influence; because of his extraordinary talents, labors, and spotless reputation. If so, then amongst the ambassadors of heaven, why should we think it strange if now, in a congregation having twelve or twenty elders, one should, by common feeling and common consent, become president of the senate* or eldership of the whole community?

By translating this influence and presidency to mean church authority, and not distinguishing between moral influence and ecclesiastic power, before the end of the second century they called the president bishop "*the* bishop," and the others were commonly regard-

* The Greek word *presbuterion,* found three times in the New Testament, may be rendered either senate, presbytery, or eldership.

Digitized by Google

ed only as the eldership; and finally *the* bishop became the only bishop, and his jurisdiction was extended first over the city—then, over its suburbs—then, over its vicinity—then, over the province—then, over the kingdom—then, over the empire—then, over the world, until it ended in "His Holiness *the Father universal*," or "the Pope."

Still it is a fact that one person can only preside at a time in one congregation; and it is unavoidable but that the most gifted and dignified will most generally preside when present, for the congregation will have it so. But confine this presidency, even though it should become stated, within its constitutional limits, (a single congregation,) and a Pope will never be born.

In all societies this presidency will obtain. It obtains in all republics; it obtained even in the fierce democracy of Greece—in the Roman Republic; it now obtains in the American Republics during the tenure of office. The senate has its president; a committee has a chairman; the Supreme Court, and all courts down to that of Common Pleas, have their president judges. It obtained in the commonwealth of Israel, in the time of Moses, in the time of Joshua, in the time of the Judges, in the time of the Kings, in the time of the Captivity, in the times when it was a Roman province.

There are hierarchs in the skies. In heaven among angels there are thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers. In the church the Lord gave first apostles; secondly, prophets; thirdly, teachers; then, various helpers. And when the church arrived at its manhood state on earth there were private persons—deacons—bishops; and of these bishops, though alike in power, one generally presided, and to this it as naturally tends as do the waters to the sea: and it is best so, provided only, all is done with knowledge, good understanding, good spirit—without pride and lordship in him that presides—and without envy, and jealousy, and suspicion, and evil surmizings among the bishops and in the congregation. And be it observed with all emphasis, *that there is no order of things, divine or human, that, in this earthly state, can wholly exclude occasions or opportunities for the display of these evil passions.* Moses and Aaron were envied, Joseph was envied, Jesus was envied, Paul was envied, and some of his acquaintance even preached Christ through envy. Humility, condescension, brotherly kindness, paternal solicitude for all the brotherhood, and a profound regard to the model Christ Jesus the Lord of all, are the only shield and defence against the workings of all evil passions.

THE DUTIES OF THE BISHOPS.

They have no legislative power, and therefore lawgiving is no function of theirs. The Messiah was careful to repeat that he only taught what he had heard and learned from the Father. The Apostles were peculiarly attentive to inculcate that they had received from the Lord whatever they taught the disciples; and the primitive elders and bishops gave all attention to inculcate only the commandments

Digitized by Google

of the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour; and James says there is but ONE LAWGIVER, who is able to save and to destroy.

1. As they are required to be apt or fit to teach, it is their duty to teach "the whole counsel of God." In doing this, they are to regard the church as consisting of little children, young men, and fathers—as consisting of masters and servants, husbands and wives, parents and children, brothers and sisters, and subjects of political government. As to the manner of this teaching, they are to have the Scriptures read in the congregation, applied to all contingencies, and diligently examined and considered by all the disciples. They are to call forth all the gifts and talents of the congregation, and to give directions concerning reading, exhortation, and prayer. It is not presumed that they are to be the only readers, teachers, exhorters, intercessors, or singers in the congregation. But they are to preside over all, to give directions to all, as far as public edification is concerned. They may call upon A to read; upon B to expound a difficult word, phrase, or passage; upon C to pray; upon D to sing; upon E to preside at the Lord's table; upon F to exhort; or they may give a general invitation to all to minister to the general edification. But no one is to read, speak, teach, or exhort in the congregation without a special call or leave of the bishop presiding for the day. They will deliver didactic discourses, admonitions, and exhortations as the exigencies of the community require. And they will occasionally labor in the word, or preach the gospel where the presence of unbelievers makes it necessary. The elders who thus labor both in the word and in teaching, as Paul teaches, are worthy of the highest honor.

2. They are "*to rule well.*" Presidency and ruling, though much akin, are not identically the same. To preside may sometimes imply no more than preserving order and decorum in the regular proceedings of a public worshipping assembly. But "*to rule well*" has respect more immediately to the disorders which are incident to every earthly community—from which the church of Jesus Christ never has yet been fully exempt. The discipline of the church is as essential as its doctrine: for no church can be prosperous or happy, however zealous for the doctrine according to godliness, if there be in it lax discipline, or if transgressors of the law of Christ are suffered to pass with impunity.

To rule well is one of the most difficult attainments. It calls for meekness, candor, firmness, courage, patience, and indefatigable attention to the first indications of remissness or delinquency. So peculiar is the assemblage of attributes requisite to ruling well, that they are more rarely to be met with than the gifts of eloquence and the highest didactic powers.

To anticipate and prevent transgression, delinquency, or actual apostacy, is much more desirable and profitable than to reprove and punish it when actually consummated. He that rules well his own family is best prepared to rule well the church of God; and he that rules well his own family needs not to be informed that more depends upon *watching* the dispositions and frailties of his children, and guard-

Digitized by Google

ing them from error and disobedience, by removing them from temptation, or by removing temptation out of their way, than in correcting them for actual offences. Much the larger part of all the errors, follies, and faults of children and of disciples might have been prevented under a discreet and attentive administration. Timely remonstrance, counsel, and the interposing oneself between temptation and the occasions of error in practice, are the great secrets of a good administration, and require degrees of wisdom and devotion seldom to be met with. More youths and more disciples have been saved from ruin by the judicious watchings of those entrusted with their fortunes, than have ever been reclaimed by corrections and rebukes. On this point a hint must now suffice: for we only aim at a full development of what is meant by ruling well. On the subject of discipline we shall have a better opportunity to illustrate good rule as contrasted with bad rule.

3. Besides the teaching, presidency, and ruling well in the public assembly, there is a class of duties comprehended in constant visitation, of paramount importance to the edification, good order, and growth of a congregation. Private, is often much better than public teaching; and reproofs, corrections, and instructions are frequently given with greater effect by the fireside than in the synagogue.

Paul, in his exhortations to the Ephesian bishops, gives his own example as the best illustration of what he would enjoin. Speaking on the class of duties to which I now allude, he says, "For the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears." Again, he says, "You know how I have been conversant among you all the time, from the first day that I entered Asia, serving the Lord with all humility, and with tears"—"teaching you publicly and privately"—"watch, therefore, remembering" these things, &c. Well might this Apostle say, "He who desires the office of a bishop, desires a *good* WORK." A *work*, indeed, which if not divided among a plurality of persons, will require much of the time of an individual or two, even in a congregation of one hundred members.

They are the most useful and successful preachers and teachers of Christ who go from house to house, and mingle with the people in their daily and constant avocations. In sickness and in health, in business and in leisure, in the most intimate social intercourse, they will find numerous occasions of doing good, and of speaking with effect, which will not occur in the meeting house or public assembly.

When the Apostles in Jerusalem, though all present in one church, and aided by many such men as Stephen, Philip, Prochorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas, and Nicholas, found it expedient to give themselves up to the ministry of the word and to prayer, and to have persons appointed to attend on the tables of the widows and the poor; may we not learn that the work of teaching and preaching Christ, of presiding over a christian congregation with dignity and profit, of ruling well, requires a devoted heart and an undivided attention, and that every business ought to have some persons set over it?

Digitized by Google

To go into all the particular duties of the christian bishop, would require us to transcribe much of the epistles; we therefore dismiss the subject, having noticed the three classes of duties already stated.

DEACON'S OFFICE.

To perfect, as far as the limits of a short essay will allow, our sketch of order, as respects the church, it is as necessary to notice the *deacon's* as well as the bishop's office. The deacon, as the name imports, is the minister or servant of the congregation. He is the steward, the treasurer, the almoner of the church. The *seven* chosen and ordained in the congregation of Jerusalem were set over the business of supplying the tables of the poor saints and widows. They are a standing institution in the christian house of God. It was anciently the custom to commit to the deacon's care the Lord's table, the bishop's table, and the tables of the poor. From all that is said of their office in the Epistles, and of their qualifications, they must be regarded as were the deacons in the synagogues—the public servants of the church in all things pertaining to its internal and external relations—in all matters of temporal concern.*

There ought to be a plurality of deacons in every church. As keepers of the treasury of the church, it is most satisfactory to him that officiates to have a companion or companions in office; and on many occasions the duties are too oppressive for a single individual.

ORDER OF THE CHURCH AS RESPECTS WORSHIP.

The worship of false gods is a scene of superlative tumult, confusion, and disorder. So is much of the corrupt worship of some who acknowledge the one only living and true God.

In the antecedent economy the tabernacle and temple worship was a perfect model of good order. Every thing was done according to a divine pattern, which was itself an image of the perfect order of the Supreme Intelligence. So exact was the obedience required, even to the utmost minutia, that Moses and the Prophets used all diligence to have the people understand all its details. To this effect spake the Holy Spirit to Ezekiel—"Son of man, show the house to the house of Israel; and let them measure the pattern."—"Show them the form of the house, and the fashion thereof, and the goings out thereof, and the comings in thereof; and all the ordinances thereof, and all the laws thereof; and write it in their sight, that they may keep the whole form thereof, and all the ordinances thereof, and *do* them."

Such was the discipline of the Jewish institution as preparatory to the christian age. Now as the christian church is God's earthly house, it would be rationally and analogically expected that the wor-

* Acts vi. 1—3. Phil. i. 1 1 Timothy iii. 8—12. Romans xvi. 1. From this last passage, as well as from 1 Timothy iii. 11., it appears that females were constituted deaconesses in the primitive church. Duties to females, as well as to males, demand this.

Digitized by Google

ship of the Lord's day would be a display of the most rational and religious arrangement—a model, indeed, of the utility and beauty of perfect order. So sensitive was our Apostle Paul on this subject, that he besought the Gentile congregations to have "all things done decently and in order."

The Apostle carries his ideas of *decency* to the minutia of a brother's uncovered head, and of a sister's veil; therefore, may we not infer that even the dress of christians in the public assembly is either decent or indecent, according to the standard of christian simplicity and decorum? If this be true of a christian's dress, it is equally true of his manners The dress and manners of God's house ought not to be after the model of the dress and manners of the forum, the theatre, or the carousals of a public entertainment.

When the heirs of heaven present themselves in the presence of the Lord, and meet around that sacred board which commemorates the ignominy, reproach, and sufferings of him who redeemed them to God by offering up himself a sacrifice for their sins; that gaiety of dress and flippancy of manners, so fascinating amongst the sons and daughters of fashion, festivity, and song, are wholly indecent, in the good sense of all the admirers of the fitness of things, or of the innocence and simplicity which adorned the ancient christians.

In the solemn assembly simplicity of dress and manners—gravity, sobriety, and serious cheerfulness, equi-distant from the morose austerity of Pharisaic sanctity and the thoughtless gaiety of Sadducean levity, are essential elements of christian decency and good order.

But we must attend to good order as well as to decency. The congregation thus organized, with its bishops and deacons being assembled on the Lord's day, in all its movements ought never to lose sight of that dignity and decorum which accord with its high and holy relations to its exalted head. The church must view herself, if sincere in her professions, as "an habitation of God through the Spirit," as "the pillar and support of the truth," as "the temple of God," and as "the gate of heaven." Every one that speaks or acts must feel himself specially in the presence of the Lord, not as on other days or in other places. Not a thought must be entertained, not a word spoken, not an action performed, that would make the disciple blush, if the Lord Jesus was personally present. The Lord, indeed, "is in the midst of them" if they have met in his name and according to his word.

We need not repeat what is so clearly written in all the addresses to the churches, that there are certain ordinances delivered to the church by her exalted Redeemer, which she is constantly to observe in all her meetings to worship him; that songs of praise, that prayers, supplications, and thanksgivings are to be preserved before the throne of grace, in the name of our great High Priest; that the Scriptures are to be read—that the word is to be inculcated, and exhortations tendered—that the Lord's death is to be commemorated—that the poor saints are to be remembered—and that discipline, when necessary, is to be attended to—are so fully and authoritively delivered to us in the

Digitized by Google

apostolic epistles, as to leave no doubt on the mind of any devoted and diligent disciple concerning the duties incumbent on every church.

But at what hour of the day, and in what sort of a house, and how often on the Lord's day the church should assemble; and whether she should first pray, sing, or read the Living Oracles; and at what period of her worship she should do this, or that, are matters left to the discretion of the brotherhood, and to that expediency which a thousand contingencies in human lot and circumstances must suggest, and for which no unchangeable ritual or formulary could possibly have been instituted. The Jews' religion was given and adapted to one nation, whose temple was fixed in Jerusalem; but christianity is designed for all nations, and is adapted to all the varieties of human circumstances, from east to west, and from pole to pole.

Whether, then, the church shall meet once, twice, or thrice on the Lord's day; and at what hours, and how long she shall continue each meeting; whether she shall sing first or pray first; whether she shall commemorate the Lord's death in the morning, at noon, or in the evening, &c. &c. must be decided by the voice of the brethren. But that all the ordinances shall be solemnly attended to, and that perfect order shall be preserved in all her worship, are matters clearly and positively propounded and enjoined.

The members of a church, when strangers are present, should always, if possible, sit together during their meetings for worship. It is impossible to preserve good order through the day if they are dispersed among strangers or occasional visiters.

In attending upon *the supper*, which is the great ordinance of the day of the Resurrection, every previous arrangement to avoid distraction to those who minister to the brethren, should be made. The disciples in this our day are very generally culpably deficient in this essential point of order. Sometimes they are so scattered over the house, as to occasion great embarassment to wait upon them; and, indeed, on this account, are sometimes passed by. At no other eating or social repast is there so much disorder as we often witness in the Lord's house. Who on any other occasion of social eating would place himself at a distance from the guests, as if to give trouble to those who minister?

Kneeling in prayer is always to be preferred, if it can be made convenient. Standing up in the celebration of praise is more rational and scriptural than sitting, especially in the solemn and social hymns and songs which are sung by all the congregations.

The Scriptures should always be read with all possible accuracy, distinctness, emphasis, and solemnity. Every disciple should carry his book to the School of Christ, and use it in all the readings and references.

Every one that addresses another, whether in salutation, in the way of inquiry, or exhortation, should do it in the most affectionate manner. No indication of levity, of passion, or bad feeling is to be tolerated in the house of God. Laughing in the church is most dis-

Digitized by Google

orderly. Jests, witticisms, and tart replies are not to be endured. No person in discussion is authorized to impugn the motives of another. Debates, whether on doctrine, or discipline, or decorum, are not admissable in a worshipping assembly. Gravity, sincerity, and profound reverence for the divine name are to be conspicuous in every disciple. Speaking fast in the church is most uncomely: so is muttering and low speaking.* The names, attributes, and words of God are not to be spoken or pronounced as the common expletives of language.

No business pertaining to this life, however connected with the church, is to be attended to at the hours for worship. Special meetings, either on the Lord's day, or on other days, ought to be called for matters purely temporal, however intimately allied to the prosperity of the church. "There is a time for every purpose and for every work;" and every thing is beautiful and orderly at that time, but at no other. So common sense and all the fundamental principles of christianity, in our judgment, decree.

The edification and comfort of the brotherhood, their growth in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ our Lord; their increase in knowledge of things divine, spiritual, and eternal—in faith, in love, in hope, and in spiritual joy, are the points to be kept supremely in view in all the business of the Lord's day in the Lord's house. There are some very small matters, and even some of these already noted are so small as to be almost beneath the dignity of our subject; yet as much of the comfort and improvement of the brotherhood depends upon them, we must, however undignified they may by some be regarded, condescend to notice them.

To be habitually late in attending the appointments of the brethren, is most indecorous; and, except in cases of sickness, to withdraw from any meeting before the final *amen*, is a violation of the most obvious rules of good order. Next to those who permit barking and fighting dogs and screaming children to torment the audience, I know of none more obnoxious to censure than those disturbers of the peace, who are ever and anon on foot, going out and coming in, as if to arrest attention, or disturb the speaker and the audience. These, and they who whisper and mutter to their companions while one is addressing the audience, except on some paramount occasion, belong to the first class of transgressors of the plainest principles of good education and good order. Such persons have as little respect for the credit of their parents and tutors as they have for their own reputation, and ought to be publicly reproved by every good bishop. For ourselves, in twenty-five years we have had but once to reprove an unfriendly alien for rudeness in a public assembly; but we have witnessed many occasions, not only amongst aliens, but friends, and,

* Some speak so loud as if they regarded loud sound as great sense; always on the top of their voice, regardless of the number or distance of their auditors. But there are others that mutter and whisper, especially their prayers, as if they were ashamed to be heard. Even in giving thanks at table, they speak so low, and so fast, as if resolved that their next neighbor should not know whether to say *Amen*. This is most uncourteous and uncomely.

Digitized by Google

with shame be it recorded, sometimes amongst brethren, which called for the sharpest rebukes which christian love authorizes.

At the close of all social prayers the whole congregation that unites in the petitions, should, like the primitive christians say, with an audible and clear voice, *Amen.* This is of more importance to the animation and devotion of the social worship than most christians seem to think. Among the Jews, on all great occasions of public and solemn petition or thanksgiving, the whole congregation said with a loud voice, *Amen!* Paul intimates that every *private person* in the primitive church was to say *amen* at the end of all petitions and thanksgivings expressed in the public assembly.* Every one feels the value of the signs of sympathy and fellow feeling, of union, harmony, and love at some time of his life; and in the christian church every one feels the power of all the signs of fellowship and accord which indicate that unity of spirit, of desire, and aim—the very essence of social worship—without which all the forms of christian communion are a dead letter.

ORDER—*as respects Voting in the Church.*

Some christians are opposed to voting in the church. They only vote against voting! They will give their *voice*; but say they will not *vote.* Now, upon a little reflection, it may, perhaps, appear to them that to vote and to give their voice, is identically one and the same thing. To express their mind or their wish on any question, is certainly to vote—whatever form of expression may be chosen, whether standing up, stretching forth the hand, or simply saying yes or no, aye or nay.

Wherever there is an election, or choice of persons or measures, there must be voting or a casting of the lot. To cast the lot is an appeal to heaven; and very extraordinary, indeed, must be the incident or the occasion that will justify such a solemn appeal, or such an irrevocable decision.

We need not labor to show that the christians under the very eye, and with the approbation of the Apostles, voted; for the Apostles commanded them to vote—to choose out persons for certain works, and with reference to certain measures.†

But a question arises of some consequence—nay, of great consequence—*On what occasions and for what purposes are christians authorized to vote?*

They are not to vote on questions of faith, piety, or morality. Truth is not to be settled by a vote, nor is any divine institution, respecting the worship or morality of the christian church, to be decided by a majority. These are matters of revelation, of divine authority, and to be regulated by a "*thus saith the Lord,*" and not by a *thus saith the majority!* But in all matters not of faith, piety, or morality; in all matters of expediency, and sometimes in questions of fact pertain-

* 1 *Cor.* xiv. 16, 17. † *Acts* vi. 3. 2 *Cor.* viii. 19.

Digitized by Google

ing to cases of discipline, there is no other way of deciding but by vote of the brotherhood. There is no revelation that A, B, or C shall be chosen elders or deacons; that D, E, or F shall be sent on any special message; that the church shall meet in any given place at any given hour, or that this or that measure is to be adopted in reference to any particular duty arising out of the internal or external relations of the church. Such matters are to be decided by the vote of the whole community, or not at all.

How that vote shall be given—whether by stretching out the hand, as the Greek word found in Acts xiv. 23. and 2 Cor. viii. 19. literally indicates; or whether by standing up, or saying *aye* or *nay*, may itself be a question of expediency, to be decided by the vote of the community. And certainly it matters not in this instance what the form be, provided only the mind of the church be clearly ascertained.

A matter of greater importance occurs: *Must the church be always unanimous before it acts upon any question of fact or expediency?* While it is possible to be of one faith and of one hope, however desirable it may be, it is not to be expected that a congregation will always be of one mind in all questions of discipline or expediency which may occur in their earthly pilgrimage. Some, however, will insist not only upon one opinion in matters of abstract speculation, but upon one mind in all matters of expediency.

In the New Testament we have the word which the Greeks used for *majority* sometimes translated "the greater part." 1 Cor. xv. 6. 'The more part." Acts xix. 32. xxvii. 11. and "the many." 2 Cor. ii. 6. Where the censure inflicted upon a certain individual is spoken of, rendered by Macknight "*the majority.*" "Sufficient for such a one is the censure inflicted by the majority;" plainly intimating that not every individual, but that a decided majority of the church had concurred in the sentence pronounced.

True, indeed, that where there is much love and great devotion to the will of the Lord, there will be the greatest approaches to unanimity, in all matters of great importance. The wisdom which comes from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and *easy to be persuaded.* Self-willedness is no ornament of christian character, and when each esteems his brother as better than himself, there will not be much earnestness displayed in striving to carry our views of expediency over the judgment of others.

Besides it is sometimes inexpedient for the majority to carry all in its power. There may be occasions when it is better for the majority to waive its privilege than to carry its point. These, however, are matters which discretion and good sense must and will decide according to the bearing of all measures upon the good order, peace, harmony, and prosperity of the brotherhood.

All warmth and impassioned feeling in the house of God is disorderly; and no church, acting under the guidance of the Good Spirit, will ever attempt hastily to decide a matter in the midst of the least excitement.

Digitized by Google

Still, however, neither reason, nor experience, nor revelation itself suggests any other method of procedure in all questions of expediency respecting men or measures, than that the voice of the majority, when clearly and fully expressed, should be cordially and conscientiously acquiesced in by the minority.

Indeed some churches make it a rule that no measure shall be adopted but upon an expressed unanimity. This, without intending it, necessarily subjects the congregation to an oligarchy or monarchy —to the dictation or to the weakness of not merely a minority, but often of a single individual. On this scheme a minority, often an individual, governs the whole church. In nine times out of ten it is more likely to happen that there will be a dissident or two, who cannot think with the majority on such matters, than that there will be a perfect unanimity. What is to be done in such cases—act or not? If the church does not act, then she is governed by a minority, and the majority yield. If she act, then is the principle of unanimity abandoned.

The only question, then, is, Whether is it most expedient and comely that the minority submit to the majority, or the majority to the minority; for one of them must yield. Unanimity we have seen very generally gives to the smallest minority the absolute control of the whole community. There can be no debate. The minority will, in the spirit of love, and in the spirit of christian modesty, agree to submit to a clear and decided majority. Having, indeed, agreed when no question is before the church that such shall be its custom, the minority feels itself always justified in submitting to the judgment of the greater part.

It is scarcely necessary to be observed that before the voice of a community can be called for, the proposition ought to be clearly stated and fully explained; so that all who vote may vote understandingly. The question, therefore, ought never to be put, until the congregation shall have had time maturely to consider the matter. Good order, indeed, being the same thing in all deliberative bodies, those rules which have universally obtained in other assemblies of the people in this country may very suitably and safely be adopted on such occasions as call for an expression of the mind of the church on any of those questions of fact or expediency which demand its decision; with this proviso only, that more courtesy, good feeling, and good spirit should always be displayed in the house of God than usually appear in the moral, literary, or political assemblies of the people.

ORDER—*as respects Discipline.*

Good discipline is as essential to the moral health, peace, and prosperity of the church of Christ, as good doctrine. Without it no society can long subsist. The theory of discipline is not discipline itself; and, therefore, it is not discipline in the book, nor in the letter, but in the church, of which we speak.

Digitized by Google

There are no laws, human or divine, which have as yet been divulged on earth, that can benefit mankind only in so far as they are obeyed. That lawgiver is yet to be born who can promulge a code of laws which will bless society whether obeyed or disobeyed. Jesus Christ has not done it. He promulged, or caused to be promulged, confessedly on all hands, the best system on earth; yet these laws improve and bless mankind individually and socially only so far as they are obeyed.

It belongs to the whole christian community to submit to his government as supreme. To have his law magnified and honored by every citizen in his kingdom, is the paramount obligation of the whole church. Its obligations and loyalty to Jesus Christ as King and Lawgiver, most solemnly and perpetually bind the christian community to unreserved obedience.

The church, in selecting bishops, has this ostensibly in view. She has as much respect to the *ruling* as to the didactic talents of those she honors with the episcopacy. She argues well, when, with the Apostle Paul she declares, by his choice, that the man who rules not well his own house, ought not to be trusted with the affairs of God's house. In ordaining her overseers, she lays her hands upon them as much to preside and rule over her, as to teach her more perfectly the way of the Lord. For this purpose, more than for simple teaching, it behooves her to have a plurality. One may sometimes teach, and one may at a single meeting preside with all dignity and propriety; but one cannot scripturally rule a congregation, if ruling be scripturally understood.

"To rule well," be it observed, is not to legislate for the church, nor is it to lord it over God's heritage. It is not to command with authority, as an absolute sovereign—it is not to dictate, as a pedagogue; but it is to have all the laws of the Absolute Monarch fully and faithfully executed. It is to have the apostolic canons supremely regarded, and all their commandments exactly and constantly obeyed. It is to have all things done decently and in order.

But, as has been observed in a former part of this essay, "to rule well" comprehends all the duties of watching over the flock, as well as correcting and removing offences when they occur. It may, perhaps, be said that watching to prevent the errors of the brotherhood falls not within our conceptions of ruling. But does it not fall within our ideas of authority? Who may watch over a flock without authority derived from the flock itself, or from the proprietor of the flock, and acknowledged by the people? And if the people confer authority on any persons to watch over them and to admonish them, the administration of that authority is with propriety regarded as a part of the duties of their office, as much as the application of the law to transgressors.

The best physicians are they who *prevent* diseases. In the same sense are they the best rulers who prevent errors and apostacies. The sovereign who, by his wisdom and timely precaution, prevents a revolt among his people, is more worthy of esteem than he who per-

Digitized by Google

mits it to occur, though he should finally succeed in putting it down. They are the best bishops, who, by their watchful attention to the occasions of falling or apostacy, anticipate and prevent delinquencies—more to be admired and loved than they who even reclaim the sinner from the error of his way, or exclude the incorrigible offender from the communion of the faithful.

To the actual discipline of the church, in its social and public capacity, belong only the offences which are committed against the whole community. Private trespasses between two or more individuals are not to be laid before the congregation until they become public offences. The commandments of the Saviour found on this subject in the 18th chapter of Matthew (and they are in accordance with our very best conceptions of propriety and expediency) go to prevent, if possible, private trespasses on the rights of individuals from becoming public offences. When those directions are faithfully regarded, it is but seldom that a private trespass comes before the congregation, or terminates in a public offence.

By *a public offence*, we mean every transgression that puts the congregation to shame—every transgression which brings a reproach upon the Lord or his people. Of course such transgressions are generally more or less known to those without the community. But should they not be known to any out of the church, if they be such, as when known, would bring reproach on the holy religion of the Redeemer, then are they to be regarded as public offences, and to be treated accordingly.

The christian church is "the pillar and support of the truth," the patroness of piety, righteousness, and holiness. She must never lose sight of her "high and holy calling;" and must, therefore, have "no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness." She must not only be pure in doctrine, but irreproachable in character. Her profession and her works must agree. That she may sustain her moral dignity, she must never display any partiality for evil doers, nor leniency for transgressors. She must never pity the sinner so much as to forgive him to the dishonor of her Lord. Those who put her to shame, she must put to shame before she receive them into the bosom of her sympathy and affection. She must have inscribed upon her shield, and displayed upon her ensigns, as her motto, "*Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.*" She is to cultivate, to exalt, and to refine her sense of propriety, and to be highly sensitive touching the honor of her beloved. She will remember that one of the highest encomiums that Jesus addressed to the Ephesian church was, that she "could bear them who are evil;" and one of the greatest censures pronounced upon the church in Thyatira, was her suffering immoral and ungodly persons to remain within her communion.

When a church has ordained to itself elders, no case of discipline can be laid before the community but through its presbytery. It is the province of the eldership to prepare the case and to choose the time for its consideration, should it be one that requires the action of the whole church. That congregation which allows any and every

Digitized by Google

member when he pleases to introduce a case of discipline, will always be insecure against scenes of confusion and disorder. Their meetings for worship will often be converted into theatres of debate, not only upon the case presented, but also upon the nature of offences in general, the rules of discipline, and the propriety or impropriety of the various measures proposed.

In many cases when complaints are made to the elders of the congregation on the delinquency of brethren, it will be possible for them to have such matters adjusted without the necessity of laying them before the whole assembly. But in cases of unequivocal public offence, the elders will have the facts and documents, the accusation, and the witnesses to sustain it, so digested and prepared as to place it before the congregation matured for their action.

In those cases it will be in good order simply to state that such a charge has been preferred against such a brother; that certain witnesses have so and so testified; that the transgressor has made no defence, or such a defence; that he has to admit so much; that he is impenitent, or unwilling to make acknowledgment; and, upon the whole premises, they doubt not his defection.

The church then is in full possession of the case, and little more will be necessary than to act upon the report, except the accused deny the facts alleged in the report. If he do not, the church by its vote separates him from its communion. But if he deny the facts alleged, the church will hear the witnesses, and then decide first whether in its judgment the facts are sustained; and on deciding this in the affirmative, will separate him from its fellowship.

But in such cases as the offender himself acknowledges his fault, or when it is proved against him in the presence of the elders, and he affords clear evidence of his penitence, report is made to the church, he appearing before it, and on being publicly rebuked and admonished, is restored to his standing in the congregation.

The elders of the church will not retain in the church, nor restore any trangressor who has been convicted of a public offence, or who, of his own accord, confesses a fault, but by a public rebuke: for, says the Apostle, "them that sin *rebuke before all*, that others also may fear." They will not, through the yearnings of pity or sympathy, "save the feelings" of a delinquent to the dishonor of Christ. They will, with christian firmness, sustain the honor of the christian institution, lest the way of the Lord should be traduced or evil spoken of. Dear as the feelings of a christian brother may be, dearer far will be the character and feelings of the Saviour of the world.

In administering a rebuke it rarely happens that it will be in good order for a junior brother to reprove or admonish a senior. It will generally be the duty of the senior elder to attend to this solemn and responsible service. In rebuking a penitent offender he will not fail to expatiate on the nature and tendency of the offence, and the occasion or temptation that led the way to it; and will also, with all earnestness and affection, admonish, beseech, and exhort to that watchfulness, meditation, and prayer, which alone can give him

Digitized by Google

strength to moderate his passions, restrain his appetites, and overcome temptation.

The Apostle Paul allows the church to appoint a committee in some cases of misunderstanding among brethren, whose judgment of the points at issue shall be final. These secular seats of judicature are necessary when the church in the aggregate are so unacquainted with the matter as not to be able to decide with judgment. Persons competent to arbitrate the case are selected by the parties or by the congregation. To these the matters in debate are referred. Their report when presented to the church, and approved, must be final. So Paul taught the Corinthians, in his first Epistle, chap. vi. 1—5. The party that will not acquiesce in the decision of one or two committees thus chosen and appointed, is worthy of censure.

The difference between misrule, ruling ill, and ruling well cannot fail to be most apparent, and to be fully appreciated in the respective effects of a good and a bad administration. Under a prudent and righteous administration of the affairs of the church, the purity and excellency of the christian institution will be sustained—offences and apostacies will be of rare occurrence. The congregation, like a well ordered family, will move in harmony and affection—will not only grow and increase in the knowledge of God, but in favor and usefulness among the people. Its numbers will be increased, and its influence in the community will be sensibly and extensively felt. The imputation of licentious and unsound doctrine will be impotent, and the ignorance of foolish and wicked revilers will be put to shame and silence.

But when every one does what is right in his own eyes, and feels himself responsible to the oversight of no person; at liberty to absent himself from the brethren as often and as long as he pleases, despising government and the restraints of Christ; mingling in the society of them who profane that sacred name which he professes to worship and adore; indulging in loose behaviour and inattention to the study of God's Book; preferring the company of the enemies of the cross, the world that crucified his Saviour, to the society of those who fear God and keep his commandments, and still regarded as a brother in Christ; the zeal of Paul and the eloquence of Apollos would fail to sustain the gospel in the midst of such disorder and licentiousness.

Add to this the incompetency and unfaithfulness of those who preside, winking at open transgression, and strongly sympathizing with what they "charitably" call the frailties of their brethren, fearful of exercising discipline; and when some flagrant outrage occurs, allowing it to be brought into the congregation as a subject of inquiry and discussion, putting the law to vote whether it shall be executed, instead of proving by testimony the fact, and faithfully applying the law; disposed rather to commiserate the offender and connive at his offence, than to honor the King and sustain his law; and, perhaps, in the absence of the delinquent, judging his case by proxy; and on some slight concession putting to vote the propriety of receiving him without a public acknowledgment or admonition, displaying more passion

Digitized by Google

or feeling than judgment, good sense, and faithfulness to God or man; and worse than all, either putting into office, or retaining in a conspicuous station in the church, those who have, not many months or years since, been a scandal to the christian name by some gross immorality. Were the twelve Apostles to preach the gospel to a community intimately acquainted with such an administration of affairs, they all could not make a single convert. Profligacy and drunkenness do not more certainly lead to bankruptcy and ruin, than such a weak and unfaithful administration to the utter extinction of the light of the gospel and final dissolution of the church. Well might Paul say, "Let the elders that *rule well* be counted worthy of double honor:" and wisely did he admonish the christian community "to salute," "to remember," and "obey them *who had the rule over them*, and to *submit themselves*, for they *watched* for their souls"—inasmuch as without this good government and subordination, the best constituted church could not long be pure, honorable, and prosperous.

ORDER—*as respects Sister Churches.*

Every church, like every family, has its own concerns; and while it owes much attention to its own interests, it owes something to the interests and prosperity of its neighbors. In order to the faithful discharge of its relative duties to sister churches, if not for its own sake, it ought for theirs, to keep a record of all its proceedings. In the church record should be enrolled not merely the names of all its members; but the date of their reception, and how received—upon their confession of the Lord in immersion in the presence of the congregation, or upon letter of recommendation from some other church.

If at any time they may have been under censure, and for what offence, ought always to be noted. And if on any occasion they may have been long absent from the church and returned to it again, good order requires that it should be registered. When any brother migrates and obtains a letter of recommendation, the fact with its date is matter of record: so is the exclusion of a member, with the reasons for which he was excluded.

A little reflection and a small portion of experience will convince the most dull of perception that such a record is necessary in some cases of discipline; in others, to the defence of the reputation of our brethren; a useful expedient to prevent imposition, and always satisfactory to those of upright behaviour. Our experience has furnished so many instances where even the date of a person's admission, rejection, or removal has been requisite either to his own vindication or that of others connected with him; for so few there are who never forget dates and circumstances, or the incidents in the history of a church of even fifty members, that much trouble and dissatisfaction, and some damage have been incurred for the want of such vouchers.

No person ought to be received from another church without either oral or written testimony of his good standing. The gospel had been preached but for a few years, till the Apostles themselves found it

Digitized by Google

necessary to give letters of recommendation to those worthy of the confidence of the brethren. Even some of the Epistles extant contain within them letters of recommendation. Paul's letter to Philemon is a beautiful specimen of a christian letter of introduction.

In order to the purity of the christian profession and the harmony of churches, when a member is excluded from one church by a solemn vote of the brethren, no other church can consistently receive him, while lying under such censure. He can only be restored on repentance by and with the consent of the congregation that excluded him: for should a sister church receive an excluded member, it would, in fact, be assuming an authority over other churches, and reversing the decision of the church that excluded him, and that, too, on exparte testimony. It would also be offering a gross indignity to the excluding church, which she could not brook, but by the sacrifice of her own reputation for good sense and good manners.

In the occasional communion of the brethren of sister churches, where it is not frequent, and the members are not intimately acquainted with each other, an invitation ought always to be tendered on the part of those who can testify of their character. This, in a well ordered church, should be made known to the elders; and they should introduce to the brethren the strangers, and invite them to a participation of the ordinances of the Lord's house. When, indeed, such visits are frequent, and the brethren are generally acquainted, it would be unnecessary to be thus formal.

If a member of one church has discovered any misdemeanor in the behaviour of a brother of another church, or has heard aught against his reputation from a credible source, he ought to inform the brother, and, in some cases, the church to which he belongs, that he may be admonished, if deserving an admonition, or defended against the malicious slanders of those without.

We owe to sister churches all respect, christian affection, and cooperation as far as in our power, or as the exigencies of society require; and ought, therefore, to do unto them as churches, what we would wish them as churches, to do unto us: for this golden rule is as applicable to neighboring churches as it is to our neighbors in our individual capacities and relations.

ORDER—*as respects Messengers.*

The church of Jesus Christ, it has been often observed, stands in certain relations to those without. She is in the world, though not of the world. To her is committed the oracles of God. The means of conversion are deposited in her hands. She is under obligation to her Lord for the use of those means, as much as every individual man is for the portion and talents allotted him. She must yet give an account of her stewardship.

When every individual member has preached Christ as far as his abilities allow in his daily conversation and behaviour; when he has given good reasons for the hope which he entertains, both by word

Digitized by Google

and behaviour, to those within his reach; and when the whole congregation, of which he is a component part, has done all it can to illuminate the region round about, both in its public meetings on the Lord's day, and all its members in their private and individual intercourse with society; still there are regions more remote to which this influence cannot immediately extend.

Not as a substitute for this sort of preaching and influence, but as an appendage to it, there is a wise provision in the christian constitution, which, indeed, is indispensable to the genius of a proselyting institution. The Jews' religion was not a proselyting institution. It contemplated one family alone as the covenanted people for the time being; and conversion to that religion, on a large scale, would have been to nullify its design. But Christ's religion is for *all nations*—for the world; and, therefore, a proselyting spirit and a proselyting system are essential to its object and design. Hence in Christ's commission to his Apostles, the whole world was their diocess. These Apostles, guided by the spirit of the gospel, and not by the spirit of Judaism—the spirit of the New Constitution, and not the spirit of the Old Testament, interwove into their order of operations the *evangelizing scheme.*

Their plan was first to set the church in order for its own sake: to place *over* it bishops, and *under* it deacons. Then if these bishops could labor in the gospel as well as in teaching the church, they might labor in the word all around their charge, as well as feed the flock of God. This was the system for all the fixed golden lamps. But there were planets, messengers, sometimes called Evangelists, separated to the work of proclaiming the word and planting churches. These were ordained by the church and commended to the grace of God for the work appointed them, and amenable to the church who sent them out. Then was the whole system complete: the fixed stars and the planets co-operating in one grand moral system, for illuminating and saving the world.

A community with its bishops and deacons at home, and its evangelists abroad, every one faithfully at his post, performing his duties to the Lord and to the people, fully displayed the active and salutary spirit of the christian institution. Take for an example the church in Antioch, in Syria, as a model, because we have its operations in detail. A variety of incidents connected with its history admit us into a more intimate acquaintance with its policy and movements than is always to be expected in the slight sketches of the churches planted in the apostolic ages, spread over the pages of the Acts of the Apostles.

The history of the church in Antioch, as gleaned from the Acts of the Apostles, is as follows:—Some of the dispersed members of the church in Jerusalem went to Antioch and very successfully proclaimed the gospel in that city. "A great number believed and turned to the Lord."* Tidings came to Jerusalem. The church in Jerusalem sent as their evangelist and messenger, Barnabas, with discretionary

* *Acts* xi. 21.

Digitized by Google

powers, to assist them in the proclamation of the word, and in setting the church in order. He arrived at the city. "He exhorted them all to adhere to the Lord with full determination of heart;" and "a considerable number were" [by his means] "added to the Lord." He found the work too heavy for him, and set out to Tarsus for help Having found Paul, he brought him to Antioch. He and Paul continued "there one whole year, and taught considerable numbers." The church became so conspicuous that the disciples first received the name of Christians in that city.

During the famine that occurred in the reign of Claudius, the church in Antioch, being richer than the church in Jerusalem, contributed liberally in aid of the Jerusalem brethren, and appointed as their messengers to carry their contribution, Paul and Barnabas; who probably wished at this time to visit Jerusalem on their own account. They faithfully fulfilled "their *ministry*," and expeditiously returned to Antioch, taking with them from Jerusalem, John Mark. After their return they became resident members of the church in Antioch, and so continued for some time.

Finally, as they were one day ministering to the Lord and fasting, at the suggestion of some of the teachers in that church, the Holy Spirit signifying it, Paul and Barnabas were ordained by the imposition of the hands of the seniors of that church, to the work of the Lord, in preaching the gospel, and in planting churches. They were thus set apart and "commended to the grace of God," for the work to which they had been called, and immediately departed. On this first tour of Paul and Barnabas, in company, they first stopped at Seleucia, a seaport of Syria, twelve miles west of Antioch. Thence they sailed to Cyprus, an island in the Mediterranean sea, and landed at its principal port, Salamis. They traversed the island from east to west, and made some stay in Paphos, a city on its western side. There they converted Sergius Paulus, the governor of the island.

From Paphos they sailed to Perga in Pamphilia, a country in Asia Minor, bordering on the Mediterranean. From Perga they proceeded to Antioch in Pisidia, a town 180 miles west by north from Tarsus, the native city of Paul. There they planted a church in the middle of much persecution, and published the word of the Lord in all the region round about. Being finally expelled the territory of Pisidia, they proceeded to Iconium, the capital of Lycaonia, 150 miles W. N. W. of Tarsus, in which city they were very successful and made many disciples. They continued there for "a considerable time," until the jealousy and persecuting rage of the Jews compelled them to fly to Lystra, a city of Lycaonia, 40 miles distant from Iconium. There they proclaimed the gospel with great power. But from Antioch and Iconium the Jews, hearing of their progress, flocked to Lystra, and succeeded in instigating the citizens to stone them. From Lystra they fled to Derbe, some 20 miles distant, and there planted a church. Thence they visited Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch in Pisidia greatly confirming the souls of the disciples. And having constituted them elders in every city in which they had founded a church,

Digitized by Google

they returned to Perga; and thence went down to Attalia, a city of Pamphilia, situated on a bay of the Mediterranean, whence they sailed to Antioch, on the Orontes in Syria. When returned to the church which sent them out, by command of the Holy Spirit, they called for a meeting of the brethren, and reported progress. So ended their first tour, in which they visited ten cities, and traversed by sea and land about 800 miles. In their ordination to the work, in their being commended to the grace of God, in their courage, diligence, indefatigable labors, and in their reporting progress to the church that sent them out, they are a model to all missionaries and evangelists in all ages of the world.

They spent a considerable time in Antioch with the disciples. They were again chosen by the church, and sent as messengers, together with some others, to Jerusalem, to consult with the other Apostles and the church, on a question which the Pharisees who believed had agitated. On their way they proclaimed the word in Phenicia and Samaria, and attended upon the business committed to their care at Jerusalem. The church in Jerusalem elected and appointed two messengers to accompany them back to Antioch, by whom they sent a letter in answer to the question propounded. They arrived at Antioch, delivered the epistle, and, after spending a few days with the disciples, the Jerusalem messengers were dismissed to the Apostles at Jerusalem.

Paul and Barnabas continued for some time at Antioch; and after some days the brethren commended Paul and Silas to the grace of God, when they departed on another tour. After a more extensive journey than that in which Barnabas accompanied him, he again returned to Antioch, reported progress, and spent some time there.

He, again, in company with others, made another still more extensive tour; returned to Jerusalem, but was there prevented from returning to Antioch: for he was seized by the Jews and sent a prisoner to Rome.

Now although the Apostle had from the Lord Jesus a commission to the Gentile world, and a liberty of action above all ordinary men; yet, we find him acting for a great part of his life under the direction of the Antiochan church, in the capacity of one of her messengers. True, indeed, in all this he was filling up the duties of his mission from the great head of the church. But may we not from these premises learn the ordinary practice of the primitive church—when we find the extraordinary ministers of Christ themselves setting us an example of all subordination to the authority and wishes of the christian communities, and of placing themselves under the supervision and protection of the church?

Is not, let me ask, (and it is all that our present subject demands,) the following inference clearly deduced from our premises:—That the primitive church did send out and patronize messengers on all errands connected with the peace and prosperity of all the churches, and with the conversion of the world? If this be answered in the affirmative, are we not under obligation to go and do likewise, as exigencies and occasions require?

Digitized by Google

Many of the evangelists possessed extraordinary gifts, and in general were men of great prudence, courage, zeal, and diligence. The letters to Timothy and Titus, and the frequent allusions in the other epistles to such men as Epaphras, Tychicus, Sylvanus, Aristarchus, Mark, Aquila, Stephanus, Fortunatus, Secundas, and Achaicus, abundantly show what sort of persons ought to be selected to perform the work of an evangelist. The eloquence of an Apollos, without prudence, humility, and patience, would be unavailing. The Apostles themselves, who acted sometimes as deacons, sometimes as bishops, but oftener as evangelists, furnish us the best and fullest models for those who should be chosen by the congregations to repromulge the gospel in our own times and country.

When fit persons for this work are found, if a single church is not able to support them in the work, one or more churches may cooperate with them, not only in the choice, but also in the support of such as may be profitably employed. The first evangelists were sometimes chosen by a plurality of churches, and sustained by them. If not chosen by the churches at one and the same time, they were sent out by one, approved by another, and another, and sustained by all; as a certain brother to whom Paul alludes in his second letter to the Corinthians, who he says was "*chosen by the churches*," and sent by them on a special errand. Silas was sent by the Jerusalem church to Antioch; and by the Antiochan church he was, in company with Paul, "commended to the grace of God" as a fellow-laborer in the gospel.

But we are now speaking of that order which should characterize all the messengers of the congregations in all their movements, in whatever ministry they may have been received. In the first place it would be out of order should they not faithfully attend to the work assigned them; which may happen, when, like John Mark, on one occasion, they desert the field of their labors—when, like some others, they dispute and debate about matters not within their commission, or when they cease to make reports to the churches that patronize them, or refuse to be under the direction of any.

Paul exhorts that every man should "wait on his ministry," whatever it may be. He is neither to assume what has not been committed to him, nor to "neglect the gift" conferred upon him. He should "make full proof of his ministry;" and as a steward, be found faithful to the trust committed to him.

ORDER—*as respects the Labors of an Evangelist.*

Every man that works rationally works by rule. The evangelist, like the bishop, ought to be a *workman*—a workman, too, that, according to rule, "rightly divides the word of truth." If the office of a bishop be "a good work," the office of an evangelist is no less so.

He first chooses a field of labor, and then begins to "labor in the word." The choice of a field requires as much judgment spiritual, as the choice of a farm requires judgment carnal. In choosing a field

Digitized by Google

he has to consider the soil, and then his own resources. This is, indeed, a difficult task. The apostles and first evangelists sometimes pitched upon the wrong soil; but "the Spirit suffered them not" to lose their energies upon it. He is a wise man that knows his own weakness, and presumes not beyond his strength.

But when a suitable field of labor is selected either by himself, or by others for him, he then goes to work and fully tests the soil. "Cultivate a small farm, and praise a large one," is a maxim as old as the Roman poet. The wise and prudent evangelist cultivates a small farm, and cultivates it faithfully. He goes from house to house, as well as from meeting to meeting, and takes the people as he finds them. He is courteous to all—rude to none. Humble, affable, communicative, he dogmatizes not. He takes no side in politics, in neighborhood broils or bickerings, in party feuds, or in family rivalries. He makes known nothing but Christ, and Christ crucified. He gives no occasion to rich or poor to despise him. He thus permits no man "to despise his youth," his manhood, or old age.

Into whatever house he enters it is for peace, and not for war. He prays for peace on every dwelling. He is not censorious, pharisaic, nor disgustingly familiar. Firm, mild, and conciliatory, he persuades by manners, as well as by words. He can sacrifice every thing to human prejudice but truth, honor, and righteousness. True to his Lord and faithful to men, he "speaks the truth in love." He sees—he knows the world is full of darkness, ignorance, superstition, and error. He removes the darkness, not by inveighing against it, but by presenting the light, and seeks to reform the world more by persuasion than denunciation.

He works not only by general rules; he preaches not to every man as if all the world were Jews, Samaritans, or Infidels. Is the Bible acknowledged—is Christ regarded as the Son of God? Then he presses not so much the truth of these undisputed matters, as he enforces their certainty and authority on the proper evidence. If Jesus be acknowledged as the Messiah, he developes the meaning and value of the proposition; but if not so acknowledged, he proves, as did the Apostles, that *Jesus is the Christ.*

When this fundamental point is established and fully proved by the law, by the Prophets, by the Apostles, and candidly acknowledged, then, and not till then, does he press obedience upon his audience. The motives to obedience are urged with scriptural clearness, certainty, and authority. The gospel treasury is opened, and its gold, frankincense, and myrrh are presented. It is not the fire of hell, but *the love of God*, on which he delights to dwell. It is not the uncertainty of life and the certainty of death, so much as the certainty of eternal life and eternal death, from which he deduces hisappeals.

But more important still, in preaching Christ, he indulges not in the humor of wit, the spirit of sarcasm, or levity, or pride. He knows that his temper and doctrine must agree; and that Christ can be successfully preached only when preached according to the spirit and temper of Christ.

Digitized by Google

He preaches Christ, the hope of glory, and not the theory of Calvin, Luther, Wesley, or the Pope. He preaches Christ and not the Spirit, nor any theory of spiritual operations. He makes, or seeks to make, converts to Jesus Christ, and not to a theory of redemption. It is the person and the office of Emanuel, and not the speculative philosophy of the schools, to which he invites the attention of his audience.

When Christ is thus preached, and God's testimony concerning him believed, he enforces that reformation of life—that obedience which the Lord expects and demands. He answers the penitent inquiry, "*What shall I do?*" in the very words of the Apostles, and with their own explanations. As the gospel was first fully preached in Jerusalem, *he begins at Jerusalem*, where the Lord commanded his Apostles to begin.

The Acts of the Apostles are his guide, and he makes them the guide of those who are disposed cordially to obey the gospel. Finally he calls upon all that believe in Jesus as "made Lord and Christ," and repent of their sins, to separate themselves from the world, by dying to sin, by being buried with the Lord, and rising to walk in a new life. Laboring to convert men to Jesus Christ, and not to a human system or to a sect, he declares "only the testimony of God." If he find men sceptical of that testimony, he proves it to be the testimony not of men, but of God; and this he does always in reference to the peculiar objections or doubts that may come in his way. He always remembers that the miracles and attestations recorded "were written that men might believe that Jesus is the Messiah; and that believing, they might have life through his name." To prove the testimony, explain the testimony when necessary, and to enforce it, is all that falls legitimately in his way until it is received. He that seeks to build up a party, delights to dwell upon its peculiarities; for to these he seeks to make converts. Such converts need no baptism; for it is into a *theory*, and not into a *person*, they are sought to be initiated He dwells upon the peculiarities of a person, and not a doctrine, and therefore he requires his converts to be immersed; for immersion has primary respect to a *person*, and not an *opinion*.

ORDER—*as respects Baptism.*

It was "into Moses" the Jews were immersed;* but it is "into Christ" that all believers, whether Jews or Gentiles, are to be baptized. Of course those that are persuaded that Jesus is the only Saviour of the world are willing to confess him, and to submit to him as the commander of the people.

When, then, the believers are led to the water, the preacher demands of them a confession of their faith in the person and mission of Jesus the Nazarene. Immediately before their burial they confess him to be the Son of God, *as to his person;* and the Messiah, *as to his office.* The question proposed is always in substance, 'Do you be-

* *Cor.* x. 1. 2.

Digitized by Google

lieve that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God, the Messiah?' Each individual believer, to whom personally, and not in the aggregate, the question is tendered, answers distinctly in the affirmative. True it is, that "with the heart a man believes to righteousness," and "with his mouth he confesses to salvation."

The immerser then taking him into the water, or bath, says, 'By the authority of the Lord, you are immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.' So saying, he buries him in the water and raises him up again. He does not plunge him precipitately, but gently lays him down, and as gently raises him up.

There is no ambiguity or falsehood in saying, 'By the authority of the Lord *you* are immersed;' but there may be, and, no doubt, often is, in saying, '*I* immerse you.' The Romanists make the authority of the Lord apply emphatically to *I;* we, in this case, make it apply to *you.* It is certain that every one who confesses that Jesus is the Son of God and the Messiah, is immersed by the authority, or "in the name of the Lord;" but it is not equally certain that A B does it by the authority of the Lord as respects his call and mission. This may be regarded as hypercritical: be it so, if any one pleases. It is however, *true.* And if we be zealous for all that is comely and true, why not practise all that is true and comely? Very often, indeed, it is true of the baptizer and the baptized, that the baptism is, as respects both, by the authority of the Lord. But it is *always* true that he who confesses the faith of the gospel and his determination to obey the Lord, is immersed by the authority of the Lord, whoever may immerse him.

It is in good order that thanks be offered to the Lord, and his favor implored on the new converts after they are born of water. And certainly those who are glad may always sing. Prayer and praise are therefore always comely on such joyful occasions. For if on all occasions and for all favors received we are to offer our thanks to the Father of mercies, it is neither inexpedient nor improper on a baptismal occasion to raise our thank offerings to the heavens.

ORDER—*as respects the Labors of an Evangelist among the Baptized.*

He is a worthless shepherd who marks his lambs and turns them out into the forest to shift for themselves. As worthless he who gathers a few disciples, immerses them, and sets them adrift in the wilderness of sin. Such were not the apostles, the evangelists, and first preach- of Christ. When they made disciples they "*separated* them," and *taught* them Christ's religion. They "ceased not to *preach*, and then to *teach* Jesus Christ." The new converts needed teaching and exhortation after they had received the preaching. The commandments of the Lord are all to be laid before them, and the skilful and faithful evangelist will labor among them till they can take care of themselves. So did the primitive evangelists.

Much as the apostles and first preachers had to do in the way of itineracy, unless driven away by persecution, they never left the new

Digitized by Google

converts till they were able to take care of themselves. But if constrained to leave them before things were fully set in order, they soon visited them again. Paul spent years in some of the cities in which he gathered many disciples; such as Antioch, Corinth, Ephesus, &c. and even then was induced to write letters to some of them.

Some who call themselves evangelists in this our day more strikingingly resemble the ostrich than the first preachers. The ostrich drops its egg in the sand, and leaves it to the sun and the sand—to heaven and earth, to take care of it; and then itinerates the desert. Their character as evangelists is skilfully depicted in the book of Job: "The ostrich leaveth her eggs in the earth and warmeth them in the dust; and forgetteth that the foot may crush them, or that the wild beast may break them. She is hardened against her young ones, as though they were not hers: *her labor is in vain*, without fear; because God hath *deprived her of wisdom, neither hath he imparted to her understanding*." Behold the picture! You galloping itinerants, see your prototype, and reform!

He assists by his counsel, when it is expedient, even to the selection of proper persons to have the presidency over them; and from his superior knowledge of men and things and of the oracles of God, it is generally to be presumed, that his counsels will be worthy of regard in one of the most difficult duties which the church owes to herself, her Lord, and the world.

The difficulties of making a judicious selection, explain to us the reason why the Apostles so often assisted the churches in constituting to themselves elders. This, moreover, suggests to the churches the necessity of exercising all their wisdom and discretion in the selection of those whom they appoint to the work of an evangelist. We learn from the Epistles, that even in the days of the Apostles sometimes injudicious selections were made; so that all bishops did not 'rule well;' and some there were, who, in their teaching, gave too much heed to debates, and questions, and doctrines, which were not according to godliness.

When an evangelist has set up a church in one city or neighborhood, and got things so far in order as to leave them without risque, he then proceeds to another, and so on; not forgetting that in the absence of other aids it is his duty to revisit the churches he has planted and see how they do. So did the first preachers of the word.

From the apostolic records, as well as from our own experience, we learn that two are always better than one. Jesus sent out the first seventy, two by two. This fact is full of meaning, and ought to be regarded as a good precedent, if not of the obligation of a positive institution.

The preceding hints and sketches on ORDER, in all its general details pertaining to our subject, *the church*, are conscientiously and benevolently presented to all the beloved disciples of our common Lord, for their serious consideration. They were hastily written in the midst of many interruptions; but they are the results of much thinking, of many discussions, of much study of the New Institution,

Digitized by Google

and of the observation and experience of twenty-five years' attention to the internal and external relations of the christian church.

Desiring to glance at the whole matter, we could not be copious on every item essential to the right action of the infant societies so widely dispersed over an immense continent. Many of them are so wholly inexperienced in the affairs of the kingdom of heaven, that they require great plainness of speech; and for their sakes we have been as perspicuous as the variety and length of our essay would allow.

Being assured that were the suggestions contained in the preceding pages fully acted on by all the churches, we would have a much more prosperous and promising state of things than at present; we cannot, from our allegiance to the Lord, and our love for the brethren, do less than request their most serious and devout attention to this matter; unfeignedly imploring the Father of mercies that he may "give them understanding in all things" pertaining to his cause and people in the world.———All of which is most respectfully and affectionately submitted to all the holy brethren, by their brother and fellow-citizen under the Messiah.

A. CAMPBELL.

Note 1.

☞ This note should have been inserted at the bottom of page 514.

A rebuke, in popular acceptation, is due more properly to the offender than to the penitent; and, therefore, ought to be tendered rather to the sinner than to the reformer. The word *elencho*, rendered (1 Tim. v. 20.) *rebuke*, is the word found in Matthew xviii. 15. Luke iii. 19. John iii. 20. viii. 9, 46. xvi. 8. 2 Tim. iv. 2. Titus i. 9, 13. ii. 15.; and is rendered *convince, convict, make manifest*, as well as to *reprove, rebuke*.

When, then, we speak of rebuking one who has sinned and is penitent, no more is meant than to make manifest his sin and repentance, and is more properly an *admonition* than a *rebuke*.

Paul's words (1 Tim. v. 20.) are applicable to one that sins publicly. For his sake that sins, and that of the church, Paul would have him publicly convicted of his sin that he may be brought to repentance, and that others may be put upon their guard. While, then, the penitent is to be admonished and received, the sinner is to be rebuked; and if he repent not, ought to be separated from the church.

Note 2.

The number of evangelists, or proclaimers of the word, named in the New Testament, is greater than generally imagined. Amongst this class we rank the following:—John Mark, Luke, Philip, Timothy, Silas, Titus, Apollos, Erastus, Gaius, Aristarchus, Secundus, Tychicus, Trophimus, Stephanas, Fortunatus, Achaicus, Aquila, Jason, Sosipater, Epaphras, Archippus, Crescens, and Zenas, with others of less conspicuity.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number XI.—*Volume* VI.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. November, 1835.

Reply to a Reformed Clergyman---No. 7.

BY S. M. M'CORKLE, A LAYMAN.

MUCH of our friend's system of exposition on the prophecies is built on a false hypothesis; which, taken away, the whole must "go by the board."

He has been mistaking the length of dispensations; reforming dispensations, without getting them renovated; binding the dragon, without getting him bound; resurrecting spirits; making a "new dynasty" of christian kings; evangelizing the world by the gospel and judgments; transmuting a terrible ten-horned beast into one with a pair of horns like those of a lamb; and metamorphosing the *Mother of Harlots* into the *Man of Sin!* These, with many other things, I have been noticing for the purpose of showing that his system, with all the legs and props he can attach to it, will not fairly stand alone. For the above purposes I will notice the prominences of his seventh number. First, his two-horned beast—his "new Latin church in the old Latin church of Cesar."

Reformation has done but little for our friend's optics, nor will it do much while he follows the old beaten track which clerical stupidity and dullness have chalked out as the meaning of the Apocalypse. They have taxed their ingenuity, indeed, and racked their invention to discover and prove *a second beast to be a first!* They are almost as notorious for their transmutations as the Catholics are for their doctrine of transubstantiation! It is no small tax on common sense to follow them in their logical process of transmutation upon the first *beast*, ere they get him with his array of heads and horns fairly muti-

Digitized by Google

lated down to a second beast, or government, without a head, except by implication—with but a pair of inoffensive horns, like those of a lamb!

What a wretched choice of figures must divine inspiration have made when drawing your first "Latin church," all terrible, with heads and horns; and then its counterpart, your "new Latin church," which has fairly eclipsed the first in the work of blood and vengeance, with but a pair of mock weapons of execution!! Who ever saw the horn of a lamb used as an emblem of execution, blood, and fire? My worthy friend must bear with me: I cannot treat such absurdities with sober argument.

Now, brother, when did your old "Latin church" rise? When would its 1260 years have expired? Was John looking into futurity when saying, "And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea;" or was he only looking at that which had risen five hundred years before he was born? If in the past, with what propriety was it said to him, "Come up hither, and I will show the things which must be hereafter"? What dragon gave the first *beast*, if it be your "old Latin church," "his power and his seat, and great authority"? A simple answer to these simple questions, will upset your whole theory about your "new Latin church in the old Latin church of Cesar." Divine inspiration has run out a parallel between the two beasts, or governments, to the last; but our priests and commentators, by some strange spiritual legerdemain, have made two beasts, differing in genus as much as the leopard and lamb, substantially one and the same!! Now, sir, I defy all the clergy in the Protestant kingdom, with all their array of learning, to find an object for the second beast in heaven, earth, or hades, without applying it to the Protestant part of christendom, with its kings and priests at its head—its marks, brands, and designations.

This exposition of the figure will suit the clergy about as well as the saying of the Master did the Jewish priests, a little previous to the transfer of God's moral kingdom into the hand of the Gentiles.

But to return. *Item second*—Our friend's strange metamorphosis of *the Mother of Harlots* into *the Man of Sin!* Such a transmigration as the Bible no where warrants from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation! No where in scripture is a man used as a figure of a church or city. And by no rules of law, logic, or interpretation within the Layman's *ken*, is "the son of perdition" and "the great whore that sitteth upon many waters," to be made one and the same thing! Now, sir, will you have a brief common sense paraphrase on the words "son of perdition"? Christ is the proper *liege Lord*, lawgiver, and head of the church. In person and by unequivocal delegation, has the lawgiver provided for this church a perfect law, a rule of faith and practice. "Thoroughly furnished unto every good work" is his church—nothing wanting—nothing superfluous. The church by owning and obeying this Lord and Lawgiver, is acknowledged his *spouse*. The church, by owning or obeying any other *liege lord*, lawgiver, or head, becomes, in scripture idiom, *a harlot, the great*

Digitized by Google

whore, the mother of harlots, &c. These odious epithets are applied to the church when she makes unto herself, or suffers to be made, any other law, lawgiver, *lord* or *head*.

Now, sir, by what odious epithet in your vocabulary will you designate those who may arrogate to themselves, assume, or usurp the proper authority of Christ alone? Will you call them *the man of sin, the sons of perdition*, who thus legislate in the face of Heaven's high authority?—make laws by which Christ's spouse is to conduct herself in presence of her God?!—laws made in weakness, executed in tyranny and wickedness—whose penalties are excommunications, fire, and faggot.

Human legislation knows no perfection—is always making, changing, repealing, and mending without amendment; and this is done in the presence of its God—in his house! Tell me, sir, that this is not the "son of perdition," "sitting in the temple of God."

I fearlessly assert the fact, that the clergy, taken in the aggregate, with their changeable, weak, or wicked laws, executed in their pontifical pride and presumption, is nothing more or less than *the son of perdition, the man of sin*, the proper *liege lord* of the *great whore*, and her numerous *daughters*. They can find no other legitimate object for *the son of perdition*. And I defy them and creed devotees to acquit themselves of the allegation. Exterminate the whole Catholic church, *the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth*, and *the man of sin* will still exist as rampant as human legislation will suffer him to be—domineering and ruling in the temple of God. Nor will the means by which the Mother of Harlots is to be destroyed prove to be the brightness of Christ's coming at all. No where is it intimated that the kings of the earth are to destroy the Man of Sin. If so, we could prove them to be the brightness of Christ's coming.

Our friend, speaking of the means by which he consummates the destruction of the Man of Sin, says: "If, then, the Lord, by the brightness of his coming, has thus destroyed the Man of Sin," &c. Brother, you have thus destroyed *the Mother of Harlots!!* And as a proof that you have mistaken the Mother of Harlots for the Man of Sin, he is represented with his staff, his suit of subalterns, lifting up your "lugubrious lamentation" over her fall!

These mourners, who are they? Are they the kings who have just finished their work of death upon the Man of Sin, and incontinently turn about with sorrowful lamentations over his fall?

If these mourners be not parts and appurtenances of the Man of Sin, existing after the fall of the devoted Mother of Harlots, unsubdued, the Layman has yet to learn the plain meaning and force of the figures.

My dear sir, have you any security that your "lugubrious" mourners may not eventually survive the wreck of the great city, fall into connubial alliance with some of the surviving daughters, and set up a new *firm* for merchandizing in "gold and silver, and precious stones, slaves, and souls of men"? This will be the case without the Man of Sin be destroyed by *some other brightness* than that by which you

Digitized by Google

have demolished *the great city*. This is reserved for another day—another *King*. A new order of things is necessary to prevent new sons of perdition from rising, or to put out of God's temple those who have risen, who are exercising illegal authority in almost every branch of the scattered and divided flock.

Can we expect from man more than is in man—more than he has done—is doing? In the past we read the history of the future. The boasted schemes of the age, *the thousand and one* associations for doing wonders, will prove their pedigree—will but plant the ensigns of the son of perdition a little deeper—will bind the bonds of his government a little more strong—will add another proof to the thousand already past, of clerical wickedness and usurpation!

The kings of the earth may perform a work of destruction on the Mother of Harlots; she is doomed to a day of indiscriminate vengeance: but to discriminate who is, or who is not a son of perdition in the widely extended clerical kingdom, is reserved for him whose eyes are "like unto a flame of fire."

The little mistakes of our brother might be passed over, such as, "She shall have suffered a thousand deaths in dreading one;" "She shall have been long in the furnace," &c. The great city is represented as saying in her heart, "I sit as a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow." "In one hour is thy judgment come." Nor is the angel with a great millstone an appropriate figure of your "gradation" destruction. But our spiritualizers must have every thing as gradual as the roll of time, to be in keeping with their gradual spiritual coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven!

Our friend, in descanting on the seventh vial, has made one capital mistake. "Casks long retain the odor of their first wine." It lacks but one little appendage of being in perfect keeping with the most palpable blunder of the age—a few *melted rocks!*

Now, serious reader, turn to the seventh vial; and if you find in it any thing about *sun*, *moon*, or *stars*, then will the Layman throw down his pen, no more to be used against clerical ignorance, pride, strife, or presumption; but will forthwith use, keep, and preserve the offensive implement for the special purpose of tame, mute, and submissive subscription to the round 1001 associations for gulling men out of their money or liberties! As the Layman has no Latinisms at command, or outlandish interjections, in the absence of which the above digression may be considered one of his left hand ways of expressing surprize at our friend's indecorous breach upon the sun, moon, and stars, in his exposition of the seventh vial.

An item or two in our friend's 8th number will be noticed, and then come to the great point at issue; for I am beginning to think our friend and myself have made an unpardonable breach on the Editor's patience. It is a notorious fact, that men when commenting on prophecy, often incontinently turn prophets themselves. We do not directly make the allegation against our friend, and acquit ourselves of the charge. Our brother designates the parties in the "great battle which shall forever decide the fates of democracy and the papacy, the

Digitized by Google

ostensible parties in the great battle of Armageddon." Also, "the monarchies and hierarchies allied in corruption and tyranny shall be allied in their fates." "The Lord's party, the harlot's party, and the infidel." Out of the above a critic might make more than "three parties." And if the fates of monarchy, papacy, and democracy be forever fixed, what kind of government is to succeed? Your theory will not readily admit of *theocracy*; of course, and according to your argument, it must be ecclesiastic! If, as some suppose, the imperial government of Rome was the let or hindrance of the Man of Sin, preventing his rise, what is to prevent a second son of perdition from rising, when monarchy, infidelity, and democracy be all taken out of the way? You may say, 'Light and knowledge.' Will you call to mind that the mystery of iniquity had begun to work even in the days of the Apostles.

Also, your "descending angel, the harbinger of the fall of Babylon, symbolizing the many running to and fro, which Daniel saw, accumulating knowledge before the epoch of the last plagues," shall have a hasty notice.

What an inconsistent system have you hatched up between truth and error! When did the God of justice visit the world with plagues and devastation, in a time of light and knowledge? Does religious light and knowledge have a bad effect on man, that an "epoch of plagues" must succeed and follow the accumulation of *light?* This has no precedent on the page of history. What! *light and knowledge harbingers of vengeance!!* Paul, speaking of these same last days, tells us that "perilous times shall come," and goes on with a long catalogue of crimes, the known and legitimate fruits of darkness. Much proof might be quoted to this effect. It cannot be religious light alluded to by the prophet. Look into the world and see the fulfillment of the prediction in the mighty progress of arts and sciences: look into the church, a few spots excepted, and there is nothing but tangible darkness—a ceaseless confusion of tongues. Farther, the angel, which you say is a symbol of light, "illuminating the world before the fall of the city," is represented as descending—a proof that it is not on earth. A new revelation, brother! He is said to cry with a "strong voice." Can light speak without an organ? What organ is saying, or can say, "Babylon is fallen," until it be in the past?

Two little charges have I yet to notice. First, his railing accusation against *infidelity*. A second, alluded to before. If our brother can sustain some of his propositions by any predictions already recorded in Old or New Testament, the layman's charge must react upon himself. Safely entrenched behind the Jewish prophets, we Gentiles may prophesy second hand.

Our brother says, "The officers of the new government," &c. "shall, by order of the new king," &c. "divide the riches of both the ecclesiastic and political chiefs of the kingdom of the little horn, and distribute them among the friends of the new order of things." Brother, where is your "thus saith the Lord" for this distribution of *plun-*

Digitized by Google

der? No document now extant, bearing the King's seal, contains the order!

Our friend, by spiritualizing the flesh of kings, captains, and horses into *riches*, and spiritualizing carnivorous fowls, which are always considered unclean in holy writ, into "friends of the new order," may find a very improbable pretext for his distribution of wealth. Is this *order* to be given in person or by delegation?

But there is this palpable inconsistency in his theory: out of the winepress he makes a prodigious rivulet of blood, literal blood, to flow. Anon, by the potency of some spiritualizing process, the flesh of these slaughtered thousands is turned into *riches!* I have not designedly wronged our friend in giving the above as the only foundation for his strange theory; for dividing Babylonish spoil, gold, or garments!

Relative to the railing accusation, &c. Did I wish to paralyze my efforts in bringing sceptics to the faith of Christ, I would do as some have done—call them by opprobious names, such as "drivelling deists," "owls and bats," "men of blood," &c. For ages on ages past infidelity has shed no blood on account of religion. The bloodshedding in christendom on account of religion, for more than a thousand years, has been done in the outraged name of Christ! The religion of nature, your "no religion," calls for no human victims in sacrifice. A religion assuming the livery of Christ, that has transmitted spirit and authority to a numerous progeny, with the mercy of Moloch has immolated its millions.

Farther, a spirit of war always precedes hostilities. Where is this spirit most manifest? Fact says, Among the religionists. Do sceptics ever become enraged in defence of their "no religion"? Are they ever found planning schemes for "a new party in politics"? Do they ever interfere with the worship of heaven, or the governments on earth, "Sunday mails," &c.? Do they ever lift contributions, or is there any danger of them imposing a tax for the support of their "no religion?" One negative answers all these questions. Can a negative answer them if they be put to the church?

Infidelity has made no offensive war on the lives, liberty, or religion of man. The rights of men are always invaded by kings and priests! The wars waged against suffering defenceless humanity have been levied and executed in the name of the God of peace!

When infidelity is found in battle array against the cross, it will be from the encroachments, the ceaseless provocation of the church, in defence of inalienable liberty! The church will be the aggressor, as she has always been, since headed by the Man of Sin.

Priests, restless ambitious priests—the implacable enemies of liberty—the curse of curses—the scourge of God's heritage—the perpetrators of infernal horrors, have been professedly ambassadors of the *Prince of Peace!*

Brother, you must fraternize in religion the most bloody hands that have ever disgraced God's image—men who have out-acted a Nero in the great drama of human blood!

Digitized by Google

Wesleyan Methodist Reform Association.

BROTHER JONES, of London, lately enclosed to me the following letter from the *Bath Guardian*, written by a brother *William Clarke*, some years since a distinguished preacher among the Wesleyan Methodists. He happened to see a paper published by brother Jones, which occasioned a correspondence to commence between these brethren. The result was, he renounced his Methodism, and travelled a hundred miles to London to be immersed by brother Jones. He was allowed to be as intimately acquainted with the whole economy of Methodism as any preacher in England. He is now a teacher of a classical Academy, and an elder in the Church of Christ at Bath. This letter was called for by some reform meeting among the Methodists, and is a sufficient voucher for the talent and information of its author. It so fully accords with our views, long since expressed, on the subjects of which it treats, that we cannot withhold from our readers the edification and pleasure of perusing it.——EDIT. MILL. HARB.

"What are we afraid of? Of overturning our first principles? If they are false, the sooner they are overturned the better. If they are true, they will bear the strictest examination."—[*Chas. Parker*, Esq., at the late Manchester Meeting.]

To the Editor of the Bath Guardian.

SIR—If any one would know the truth in any point touching religion, which is controverted by different parties contending for pre-eminence in this world, under the covering of "zeal for the Lord of hosts," the keeness of each faction on the points in dispute must be far from him; and the less concern he has in the temporal interests of either side, the more fit is he to judge of the strength of their arguments. In the heat of controversy each party snatches the readiest weapon for self-defence, or for the hurt of his adversary. In such cases, something of the truth may be found on both sides, but mixed with a deal of falsehood, and, therefore, the more dangerous; inasmuch as falsehood is never so successful as when she baits her hook with truth, and no opinions so fatally mislead us as do those which are not wholly wrong—even as no watches so effectually deceive their wearers as those that are sometimes right. In all controversies in which the love of truth is not at bottom, truth appears not like herself,—she drudges to the ambition, avarice, or worldly ease of a set of men, and *seems* to promote the temporal interests of one faction upon the ruin of another; and is ready to be treated, by either side, according to the appearance she makes against their interests. Yet truth, wherever she appears, demands regard; and it is not the least part of the duty we owe her, to contribute to our power to deliver her from the slavery she is put to by the parties who wish only to serve themselves of her.

These remarks will apply in every case where "certain questions of men's own superstition" are mixed up with some little portion of pure revelation; but I allude, particularly, to certain measures, which, for some time past, have been in operation among the followers of Mr. Wesley, to abase the pride of the *lords* over the Methodist heritage. and to bring them into subiection to the original rules of "the

Digitized by Google

house which *John* built." But such is the power of the "honest craft"—such is their hold upon their scripturally-untaught "simple-minded" followers—such is their command over the "breeches pockets" of their piously purse-proud supporters—such is the host of their "blue stocking" and yellow pocket "band-mates," *select* and common—the number of their valiant "leaders," male and *female*—the thousands of their "stewards," chapel and circuit, who have scarcely a finger in the management of the manifold "funds" of their "reverend masters"—the troop of their "trustees," bound down by certain deeds now confirmed in Chancery, and bowed down to the very earth under the weight of their responsibilities—the companies of young men on "the list of reserve," who, "ashamed to dig," are waiting for bread—the hundreds of their brethren, already "in full connexion," who (with some honorable exceptions one would trust) are now looking forward to have a voice "in Conference," if not an elevation to St. Peter's (I mean the President's) Chair—the number of their "ecclesiastical courts," each having its spiritual inquisitor, besides the many *familiars* dispersed throughout the kingdom—such is their ability to fawn or frown, to pity or pray, to bless or bully, just as occasions require—such is the magnificence of some of their temples, and the accommodations afforded therein, for any who desire to witness a *theatrical* representation of the worship and service of the true God—such is the amount of their something-like national debt, *themselves not responsible* (and great debts give consequence)—such is the versatility of their "talents," that, in addition to their arduous spiritual duties, they can fill the situations of "financial secretaries," "secretaries to the missions," the presidency of a "theological institution," attend to the trade of booksellers, and, if reports are correct (and '*The Christian Advocate*' ought to report nothing of its *friends* but what is true) some of these "Divines" have shares in Banking and Baking Companies, which, of course, must be cause of some trouble to them—such is their tessalated scheme of things temporal with things spiritual, the Mosaic-pavement-like connexion of the "interests" of preachers and people, at least so many of the "laity" as are *worth* any thing to these patterns of self denying piety, and of the ties of consanguinity, and consequent connexional affinity—such is their concern for our "venerable Establishment," in her present dilemma, their friendship with "the Clergy," and their effrontery in asking the aid of noblemen, and "the great ones of the earth," to preside at their "public meetings," and thus to give countenance to their *Tertullonian* spoutings, and otherwise unscriptural proceedings—such is their secret influence in Tory head-quarters, and open hostility to public men of enlightened and liberal principles—such is the heterogeneous mixture, the motley group of incongruities, the compound of things terrifying and alluring, of deceit and violence, delusion and persecuting worldly power, hardness and softness, beauty and honor, deformity and baseness; in short, not to be further tedious, such altogether is the "*Wesleyan Methodist Conference*," that, it may be feared, this "old Adam will prove too strong for young Melancthon." "The hundred in Confer-

Digitized by Google

ence" will put the ten thousands in the "Reform Association" to flight, and laugh them to scorn. How many "divisions," already, have gone out against them full, and returned home empty. How many, on some little hillock of their own, have crowed awhile against this "unclean and hateful bird," who have been glad again to *creep* under its wings, bound by an engagement never "to open the mouth, or to peep." And why these failures? Because the Conference system, in doctrine and discipline, is founded upon truth? *The reverse is the case.* These "worthies" contended with "the hundred" on their own ground, which, being purely political, proved too mighty for the "dissatisfied." The monstrous compound which the Conference itself presents, and (but at the peril of its existence) *must* maintain, never had its prototype or fac-simile but in the priesthood of the Papal Church, in the darkest by-gone ages. The attempt, therefore, to effect a *scriptural* reform in Methodism, will certainly end as the efforts of a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand; or as the work of a builder, who labored to erect a cone with its apex downwards; or, to use a more familiar comparison, about as successfully as the rubbing and scrubbing of some good meaning people to make the skin of their blackmoor *as white as their own.*

Of the gentlemen who take the lead in the "Reform Association" I have not the least knowledge, but through the press: their motives, so far as they may arise from a desire to promote the religion of the New Testament, I cannot but respect; but that their measures are at variance with the word of God, no one can doubt who holds the Bible in one of his hands, and a report of their proceedings in the other. Some members of the "Association" will, in all likelihood, read these remarks, and, it may be, despise them too. The contempt, however, will not be reciprocal. In the exercise of that charity "which seeketh not its own," and dares to utter truth at the risk of all men's displeasure, I would fain hope, for Christ's sake, for I have no interest in these things further than the glory of his name, and the extension of his spiritual kingdom are concerned, that what was but merely glanced at by some in the late meeting at Manchester, will be seriously taken up, and resolutely followed out in all its consequences—"To wit," that every church, or congregation of believers, in the apostolic sense of the word, is complete in itself; consequently, subject to no jurisdiction under heaven; but, as a *spiritual body*, subject to Christ in all things *written*—not in notes, or minutes, or institutes, or commentaries, or sermons, or lectures, or tracts, or magazines, but in the "Holy Scriptures." This received as the word of God, would open the eyes to the mere human device, and consequent abomination of the "Conference plans;" and would lead on to the forming of *independent* churches throughout the connexion; that all who might be found in "the rude and undigested mass," having a taste for the apostolic gospel, might also be "set in order," to walk in primitive practices; which is *impossible* under Conference arrangements, or upon the ground taken by the Association. Might I beg to offer, in the sincerest good will, a word or two of advice to the ministers and members

Digitized by Google

of the "Reform Association." They will judge that I am no stranger to Methodism: I have long looked at it in the light of revelation, and am assured that time and truth, the tried and steady friends of all true reformers, will "tales unfold," which will fully justify what has been published to the world respecting "Conference measures," in the last year or two. But as that only which is *of* God can be the glory of God, (let *appearances* be what they may,) it would be well for the *Ministers* of the Association now to take special heed to themselves; and, however much they know of the Scriptures, to continue to search them with a trembling reverence and with a single eye, clear of all worldly expectations. And let them not shun from the fear of man, or from any hope in this world, to speak all the words of this life, and to declare the whole counsel of God: knowing this, that such a treasure is not committed to men to give out as they please. They must not only take heed of not handling the word of God deceitfully, and labor to "present every man perfect in Christ Jesus," but they must go before "the people" as ensamples of "holding fast the faithful word;" even as a shepherd who leads his flock down a hill into the vale, being foremost is *lowest.* This is the "royal road" for all New Testament ministers. And let the people themselves also give daily and diligent heed in searching the Scriptures, and examine every part of their minister's doctrine and example by the same rule, comparing scripture with scripture, that they may be followers of their pastors only as they can see them following Christ; that so their professed subjection to the gospel may appear, all being subject the one to the other, in the fear of God, opposed to what the Prophet calls "a fear towards God which is taught by the precept of men;" and which has been the cause of the endless disputes and exceeding evils which have taken place in the *christian world.* Let both preachers and people, therefore, bring all their former thoughts and opinions, in matters pertaining to the worship and service of God, to the simple standard of the Scriptures; ready to give up with every principle and practice which has no foundation there; and to take up with, and obey from the heart, every doctrine and doing that shall be found there. Even as the captive Jews, returning from typical Babylon, reformed themselves by the written law, which, through the good hand of God, remained among them, notwithstanding the captivity, and all the corruption which had prevailed among them. And herein they were encouraged by God himself, under all their wants, that they had his word and spirit remaining among them. Following their example, the "Association" would see the necessity of *radically* reforming itself; then might it see clearly that Methodism *cannot* be reformed, that is, on scriptural ground. Like the "leprous house," under the law, it must be *broken down,* and the timber thereof, and all the mortar thereof, must be carried forth into some unclean place; then all the *living* stones being built together, on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, might rise a holy temple to the Lord, "a habitation of God through the Spirit."

Digitized by Google

I have no pleasure in distorting any similitude aside from the sentiment it was brought to illustrate: my desire is, that truth may prevail. The Reformers will receive this or reject it, as they please: they would lose nothing by burning this paper, and all the books "published at the Conference press," provided they would determine to stick unto God's testimonies, and be "men of one book," that is, the Bible. But as God lives, and his word is true, and his dealings with the sons of men are uniform, not only the "Conference party," but all the "*ites*" which may retain the system of Methodism, *however modified*, shall, in the end, prove the folly, and reap the reward, of making the word of God of non-effect,—by perpetuating the *inventions* of no less a man than a "late Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford,"—accommodated by his many "sons in the gospel," the better to suit the *natural* mind of man, as well as to agree with the *spiritual* taste of modern times. "For as the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so shall their root be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust: because they have cast away the law of the Lord of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel."

I am, sir, your humble servant,

W. CLARKE.

Letter from Elder W. Jones to A. Campbell.

No. V.

London, June 17,* 1835.

Very dear brother Campbell!

THE kind and courteous manner in which you at first invited me to become your correspondent, and the frankness which has invariably characterized your subsequent letters, have combined to disarm me of all shyness and reserve, and emboldened me to address you with that freedom and familiarity which I otherwise might not have used. My letters have even assumed somewhat of a controversial cast; but your admirable Essay on "Religious Controversy" furnishes me with a sufficient apology for this. You there tell us that "religious controversy has enlightened the world," and that "while error lives, and falsehood has an auxiliary upon earth, controversy will be necessary, and argument indispensable." Besides, towards the conclusion of your last letter, you even admit the *possibility* of your being wrong on some points, and invite correction; for, say you, "should our brethren in England be more intelligent in the sacred Scriptures than we are, we will thank you to teach us the way of the Lord more perfectly, and we will also thank God for your assistance." This is placing the matter upon its proper basis. We are all of us but learners in the school of Christ, and woe be to that man that fancies himself beyond the need of instruction! Even an inspired Apostle was compelled to acknowledge he "knew but in part;" and he has given us

* *Die natali—hodie ætatis* 73! *Dei Gratia!*

Digitized by Google

this caution "against being wise in our own conceits," that, "if a man think himself to be something when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself." But a truce to further apology!

In exploring the volumes of the 'Christian Baptist,' I have been not a little surprised at some things which have there come across my path on the subject of the Decalogue, or Moral Law, considered as a rule of life to the people of the New Covenant; and especially that my friend Campbell should have entered his protest against it. On finding this to be the case, I could not refrain an involuntary exclamation to this effect: "Here is a strange affair, indeed! Mr. Campbell, who exhibits the Scotch Baptists in this country as being 'fettered and manacled and paralysed by the stays of Hyper-Calvinism,' is himself found chiming in with the Hyper-Calvinists, the only party on this side the Atlantic that has the least hesitation in admitting the perpetual obligation of the Decalogue, and on a point, too, on which the Scottish Baptist churches are firmly agreed in opposing both!" On this topic you are quite out of *our* camp, and we find you in that of our enemies. It is very true, indeed, and I have unspeakable satisfaction in recording the fact, that the grounds and reasons on which you object to the Moral Law as a rule of life, and those on which it is opposed by the Hyper-Calvinists in this country, differ as wide as the two poles; for, while the latter discard it on the score of its rigid claims of holiness—its austerity—and the strictness of its demands, your objections are of a totally different cast. Nevertheless, as I doubt their validity, I hope you will permit me to examine them a little narrowly in the present letter, and perhaps I may be able to suggest some considerations of sufficient weight to induce you to review the subject, and what you have written upon it.

Now, to lay a foundation for the remarks I have to offer, I begin by making a quotation from the first volume of the 'Christian Baptist,' where you thus express yourself:—

"Moses, the great lawgiver to the Jews, delivered this law *as a rule of life to the Jews only;* and it was all equally important to them, and binding upon them. It was holy, just, and good, as respected its design—and was equally divine and authoritative. He that touched the ark died the death, as well as he who stole the golden wedge. He that offered strange fire upon the altar was consumed, as well as he that cursed his father. He that gathered fuel on the Sabbath, and he that blasphemed the God of Israel, were devoted to the same destruction. But the law of Moses was given for a limited time. The world was about twenty-five hundred years old before it was given; 'for *until* the law sin was in the world,' and this law was designed only to continue till the promised seed should come, the great Lawgiver. Moses pointed Israel to this great Lawgiver. Malachi told the Jews to remember this law until Elias should come. The Messiah said plainly, 'that the law and the prophets preached till John;' but '*since that time* the kingdom of God was preached.' Paul repeatedly affirms that christians *are not under the law,* but under the gospel, as a rule of life. In teaching the Jews, he compared the law to a schoolmaster until Christ came; but since faith or Christ came, he assured them they were no longer under the schoolmaster. He declared they 'were *delivered* from the law'—they were *free* from it'—'they were *dead* to it.' He says, 'It is *done away*'—it is *abolished*'—'it is *disannulled.*' "

" 'Then,' say the popular teachers, 'you have no moral law as a rule of life—no preaching of the law as a means of conviction of sin; you may live as you

Digitized by Google

list—your doctrine is licentious—it is Antinomian—it is dangerous to morals—to piety—to all good.'

"Blessed Jesus! art thou thus insulted by pretended friends? Are thy laws an inadequate rule of life? Guided by thy statutes, will our lives be licentious, our morals loose, ourselves abandoned to all crime? Was Moses a more consummate lawgiver than thou? Did his commandments more fully or more clearly exhibit the moral, the godly course of life than thine? Were the sanctions of his law of more solemn import, of more restraining authority than thy precepts? Is there no means of conviction of sin, of its evil and demerit, in thy doctrine, manner of life, or in thy death? What argument, what inducement to cease to do evil and to learn to do well, in all the laws of Moses, in all the statutes of Israel, in all the examples of patriarchs, saints, and martyrs, speaks such language, exhibits such motives, conciliates such regard, denounces such vengeance, attracts so much reverence, inspires with so much awe, wins with so much goodness, and reconciles with so much power as *thy death?* That heart, O Lord! that feels not the force of this argument—this omnipotent argument—to cease to do evil and to learn to do well, in vain will be assailed by moral suasion or by moral law. The thunders of Sinai—the flashing fluid of unmeasured force—the rending echoes of the celestial trumpet—the nodding summit—the crashing rocks, and the trembling base of the smoking mount, veiled in the blackest darkness, cannot restrain nor allure it to righteousness, humanity, and the love of God. Philosophy, marching forth in all her imaginary strength, clad in all her fancied charms, is perfect impotence compared to thy doctrine. The example of patriarchs, of prophets, of saints, and martyrs, from Abel to Noah—from Abraham to David—from David to John the Baptist, are inefficacious compared with thine. Moses and his fiery law, his statutes, and his judgments, as the body without the spirit is dead, are lifeless and inoperative compared with thy new commandment, thy piercing law, animated and quickened by thy life, confirmed and sanctioned by thy death. No; the statutes and ordinances commanded in Horeb—the meekness of Moses—the patience of Job—the zeal of Elijah—the piety of Daniel—the pathos of David, and the wisdom of Solomon, will not, cannot illumine that understanding, captivate those affections, purify those desires, purge those motives, subdue those lusts, which thy doctrine, thy example, thy law, thy love, thy sufferings, thy death, thy resurrection, thy exaltation, fail to accomplish. But did thy character—thy doctrine—thy life—thy death—thy resurrection, and thy exaltation ever fail, when fully apprehended, ever fail to purify—to renovate—to reform? No! never! never! Who can know thee and not love righteousness, and not hate iniquity? When the dying thief, in his day, saw thy character and heard thy fame, he entrusted his soul to thee, and preached righteousness to his companion. When the persecuting Saul saw thee, O Saviour of the world! enthroned in glory—when he heard thy winning voice, he fell beneath the rays of thy majesty, and from a lion put on the meekness of the lamb.

"Yet having thy New Testament, ratified in thy blood, are we without a rule of life?—are we authorized to live as we list? The thought is impious! O, Sun of Righteousness! thy salutiferous rays were long expected to enlighten, to cheer, and to quicken those sitting in darkness, in the region and shadow of death. Yet thou hast risen, and more glory shines from the *clouded* face of Moses than from thine! Great Lawgiver, the Gentiles long waited for thy law—and hast thou left them without law, to live as they list? Moses and Elias waited on thee on the holy mount—they laid their honors and their commission at thy feet. When they ascended to the skies, thy Father's voice commanded thy disciples to *hear* thy law—to yield exclusively to thee: and shall we not? Forbid it, Heaven

"Lord Jesus, may thy character open to our view, as depicted in thy doctrine, thy miracles, thy sufferings, thy death, thy resurrection, and thy glory; and then we shall not fear to put ourselves exclusively under thee as our Lawgiver, our Prophet, our Priest, and our King."

Digitized by Google

This extract furnishes us with a luminous statement of your views on the subject in hand; and as often as I have read it, which I have never done without being delighted with the glow of eloquence which pervades the whole, it has always reminded me of a surly old mathematician, that we formerly had in this country, of the name of Vince. Whenever this good man's attention was called to a piece of fine writing, he rarely failed to meet it with the question—"Well; but *what does it prove?*" In his vocabulary, eloquence and argument were not convertible terms! Now, my dear friend, to apply this anecdote, I would say, that I greatly fear many of your readers are in danger of confounding these two things; they have been so charmed with the graces of composition and elegancies of style, as not to allow themselves to consider whether the reasoning be conclusive—whether the premises sustain the conclusion, or the conclusion flows legitimately from the premises.

Let us examine this matter a little closely, and satisfy ourselves how it really stands.

You commence with telling us that Moses delivered this law—the Decalogue, or ten precepts, *as a rule of life to the Jews only*—that it was given for a limited time—that when Messiah came its obligation ceased—and that, consequently, christians are not under that law as a rule of life, but under the gospel. This is the sum of what you teach on this subject. Now admitting these principles to be correctly laid down, let us see what consequences must follow upon them.

If the moral law was a rule of life to the Jews *only*—and if, as you say, the Gentile christians are delivered from it—free from it—dead to it; if it be done away—abolished—disannulled, like the Jewish ritual in general, then it can have no claims upon us for obedience—we are at perfect liberty to disregard, despise, reject, or renounce it. But, allow me to ask you, do you really feel yourself at liberty to do so? There can be no better way of testing this subject than by bringing it home to your own experience, convictions, and feelings. What are the requirements of this law? Our Lord has furnished an answer to this question, Mark xii. 30.—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and soul, and mind and strength, and thy neighbor as thyself" This is the sum of the requirements of the two tables of the law. Now which of them has ceased to be binding upon you? But perhaps you will evade the force of this appeal, by telling me that you recognize your duty in reference to both God and your neighbor, because it comes to you armed with the authority of Christ and not of Moses. Well, then, let us turn to Exodus xx. 1—17. and examine these ten precepts, *seriatim*, as delivered by Moses:—"Thou shalt have no other gods before me." "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," &c. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," &c. "Remember the Sabbath (or a seventh part of thy time,) to hallow it to the Lord." "Honor thy father and mother." "Thou shalt not kill." "Thou shalt not commit adultery." "Thou shalt not steal." "Thou shalt not bear false witness." "Thou shalt not covet," &c. Now I ask you, my

Digitized by Google

dear friend, which of these ten words has ceased to be imperative upon us? Which of them is abolished—done away—disannulled? Which of them do you feel yourself at liberty to disregard or disobey? How many of these precepts can you break without bringing guilt upon your conscience? I need not wait a reply—the thing speaks for itself. To what, then, does all your elegant declamation against the perpetual obligation of the moral law, as a rule of life to christians, amount? Why, to a mere logomachy—a strife of words! When you can tell me, in plain terms, that you feel yourself at liberty to kill, steal, commit adultery, bear false witness, covet your neighbor's property, &c.: and can do all this *with a clear conscience*, being persuaded that all these precepts, as given to the Israelites by Moses, have been done away by the Christian Lawgiver, I shall deem your objections valid, but not till then!

My dear friend, I would fain persuade myself that I have said enough to induce you to review your sentiments on this subject; and I cannot but think, that if you do so with calmness and impartiality, you will find you are wrong. It is no uncommon thing for the cleverest men to lose their way in an argument; hence the proverb, "Every man trips at times." The great John Locke did so when he confounded innate ideas with innate principles. My brother Campbell does so evidently, when he identifies the *standard of holiness*—the eternal rule of wright and wrong—which, in the nature of things, must be the same under every dispensation, with the *motives* to love and obedience, which vary according to circumstances. I find, by your published volumec, that you have raised a host of opponents against you, by denying the moral law to be still binding upon christians as the rule of their obedience—and how do you answer them? Why, by expatiating, in eloquent terms, on the all-paramount and powerful *motives* to love God and keep his commandments, which spring natively from the gospel of divine grace, the death of Christ, and the blessings procured by it for the children of men. Probably not one of your opponents would hesitate a moment to admit the full force of all you say on this head; but what then? It leaves the point in dispute between you and them untouched. *We* say with you, in the language of the poet,—

> *"Talk they of morals? O thou bleeding Love!*
> *Thou maker of new morals to mankind!*
> *The grand morality is love of thee!"*

That the love of Christ, in dying to redeem guilty rebels from everlasting misery, is the grand *motive* to universal holiness, we all admit; but to say that the death of Christ has annulled, abolished, and destroyed the eternal rule of righteousness, the *standard* of all holiness, is perfectly new doctrine to me, and what I think was never taught by either Prophets or Apostles! Pardon me if I add that there lies, somewhere in your reasonings on this subject, a fallacy which remains to be detected. Perhaps it may, under the blessing of God, assist you in discovering the lurking traitor, if you weigh well the following things:

Digitized by Google

1. The Moral Law, or Decalogue, is not a positive or temporary institution, but founded on the very nature of God—being a transcript of his holiness, justice, and goodness—on our relation to him as his creatures, and the subjects of his moral government—and on our relation to one another, as possessed of the same common nature, and connected by various ties. It stands upon the immutable and essential distinction between moral good and evil, right and wrong; and, consequently, in substance, must remain the same under every dispensation. It was written on the heart of Adam as the law of creation; and notwithstanding the fall, there are traces of this law still remaining in the conscience of every man, sufficient to constitute him a sinner, render him inexcusable, and condemn him. It is from these natural notices of God and his law, that the Apostle convinces the heathen of sin.—Rom. i. 20—22. and ch. ii. 14, 15.

2. When the Most High entered into covenant with the Israelites at Mount Sinai, he delivered this law to them as the very words of that covenant, and wrote it with his own finger, in ten precepts, upon two tables of stone. Exod. xx. and xxxi. 18. Now, as delivered to this people, the Apostle Paul teaches us that it had a two-fold aspect, which he distinguishes into flesh, or letter, and spirit. For as it stood in that peculiar covenant, it was suited to the manifestation which Jehovah made of himself to that earthly nation, as their God who redeemed them out of Egypt. It bound them to observe all the statutes and judgments, ceremonial and judicial, contained in the law of Moses. Thus it was the rule of their national righteousness, according to which they enjoyed the good things of the land of Canaan—and it was sanctioned by temporal rewards and punishments, suited to that worldly establishment, in which God stood related to them as their political sovereign. This was the *letter* of the law; and touching the righteousness which is in it, the Apostle says he was blameless. Phil. iii. 6. And it is in this sense, and this sense only—viz. *as forming a part of the old covenant*, that we can consider it as no longer binding on Gentile christians. For when we view this law as requiring perfect love to God and our neighbor—forbidding every lust and irregular motion of the heart—promising eternal life upon condition of perfect obedience—and denouncing the curse upon every the least failure, it is evident that neither ancient Israel, nor any of the sinful race of Adam, could ever personally stand in covenant with God, or obtain eternal life by it. In this sense it was given to convince of sin, and stop every mouth—it was given with a view to the promised seed, who was to come of that people, to be made under the law, to fulfil it—bear its curse for his guilty people of all nations, and thus obtain for them the remission of sins and the eternal inheritance. Hence,

3. When our Lord entered upon his public ministry, as the great prophet and lawgiver of his church, he thus addressed his disciples: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in nowise pass from the

Digitized by Google

law till all be fulfilled." And so he adopted the moral law, the eternal rule of righteousness, as the law of his kingdom—delivering it to his disciples as the rule of their obedience and conformity to him, and that in a way corresponding to the more perfect state of matters under the new covenant. Matt. v. 17—20. Instead of being "done away—annulled—abrogated," &c. we here find it ESTABLISHED by the authority of the christian lawgiver as the law of his kingdom, and none of the least of its precepts is permitted to be broken. Accordingly we find his Apostles, throughout the whole of their writings, teaching the disciples to observe this law, both in its general principle and particular precepts. See Rom. xiii. 8 11. 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. Gal. v. 14. 1 Tim. i. 6–12. James i. 25. and ch. ii. 8–13.

I have only room to add an apology for the liberty I have taken with my esteemed friend in this letter, and I shall do it in the words of a late writer, hoping you will subscribe to their truth, and allow them their full force. "The man who undertakes to correct one's mistakes, does one A GREAT HONOR. He remonstrates in the hope of reclaiming; but before he can hope to reclaim, he must pre-suppose all those amiable dispositions, which enable a man to say, *I am mistaken.*"——Farewell, my dear friend, and believe me, as ever,

Yours, faithfully,

W. JONES.

John's Immersion---No. 3.

Of the Salvation enjoyed by those who embraced John's Teaching.

WE must now endeavor to ascertain something about the gospel addressed to the Jews, by John and the great Apostle of our redemption. What salvation was it, that they were to enjoy, in the remission of their sins? From what calamity—from what punishment, was this ancient race—this elect people, now to be preserved? These are questions demanding our strictest attention, and the calmest deliberation; for it concerns very nearly all those, who, devoted to the word of truth, are desirous of knowing what God has said to the world. And having ascertained that the sins remitted, under the teaching of John, were those committed against the law of Moses, we naturally turn to him to inquire what punishment he denounced upon his countrymen for their transgressions of the holy commandments. Let us, then, roll back the flood of time, and examine this matter with a scrutinizing attention. We turn to the record of Moses.

Passing by the curses pronounced upon Adam for his transgression of the commandment delivered to him, and the judgment passed upon the world for its wickedness in the days of Noah; in both of which cases the penalties were purely of a temporal nature; let us direct our attention to Sinai. The institution set up there was glorious and wonderful in its character. It came through ranks of messengers; and the King of kings, in making it, condescended to speak much of it to his servant Moses. In submitting to it, the Hebrew nation agreed to look to Jehovah as its sole monarch—acknowledging his authority alone, obeying his precepts, sustaining the honors of his name, and disseminating abroad through the earth a knowledge of his perfections; if

Digitized by Google

they had faithfully complied with the terms of the contract, how different would the pages of the world's history have looked. The institution established on Sinai demanded the most unreserved obedience on the part of the subjects of the King—and in case of failure, the most terrible *temporal* calamities, were denounced upon the rebels. In all of the communications of Jehovah to man, until the appearance of "the exact representation of his character" upon the earth, there is not the slightest promise of any thing more than temporal rewards and temporal punishments. Let us keep this in mind now, and we shall easily solve many problems created by the theorizing schoolmen of the Apostacy. In order, however, to have it fully before us, let us analyze the conversations of Jehovah with our first parent, Adam—Noah, Abraham. First of Adam: "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, (or, in other words, For thy disobedience of my commandment,) cursed is the *ground* for thy sake—in sorrow shall you *eat of it all the days of your life*. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field: in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, *till thou return to the ground;* for out of it wast thou taken." There is not one word here of any thing beyond the grave—no promise of eternal life, no threat of eternal punishment. So with the wicked generation, to whom Noah was a proclaimer of righteousness: it refused to listen to his warning voice, and the flood came upon the world of the ungodly, and it was destroyed from its face. Abraham, the illustrious father of the faithful, received two promises: 1st. "I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing. I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curse thee." 2d. "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." In these two promises, we find the germ of the Mosaic and Christian dispensation; but as well might we say, that all the glories, mercies, and goodness of God, as set forth in the Mosaic dispensation, are deducible from the first promise, as that all the transcendent wisdom, benevolence, and love of God, portrayed in the christian institution, was fully apprehended and known by the knowledge of the second promise. It is one thing to receive a promise—it is quite another to appreciate the blessings of the promise. Abraham did not understand from these promises any thing of a future life—of immortality. These matters were first brought to light by his illustrious descendant; for had he known it, there could not have been "something *better* reserved for us; but he before us, would have been perfect." "Though highly commended on account of his faith, he did not enjoy the fulfilment of the promise, *nor the blessings flowing from it.*"

Four hundred years after the promise made to Abraham, we find an immense assemblage of persons, the descendants of him to whom the promise was given, gathered in the plains of Moab, listening to the valedictory address of the great lawgiver. We have found that up to this date nothing yet has been said to man in the way of a covenant for immortality—he has not yet received the promise of it, neither in the conversations of Jehovah with Adam, Noah, nor Abraham. Thus far the transactions of God with man refer to temporal matters alone. Now, shall we find any thing more in the law? Shall we give to Moses the high honor of promulging the principle of life and immortality? Let us weigh this matter well, and linger around the promise until we can conclude safely.

We have reached the plains of Moab, and there we find Moses about to lay down his power, *without himself reaching the shadow of the heavenly rest.* Before leaving the nation with which he had been so long connected—before resigning the office in which he had exhibited so many splendid manifestations of the wonderful goodness and benevolence of him who had called him to do an extraordinary work, he sums up the whole matter—the *cui bono* which was to follow all his labors. Not only that; but he developes the consequences which were to result from disobedience. Here, then, we shall surely find all the good which the Israelites were to receive for obedience—all the curses which were to fall on them for rebellion; and what are they? Are they tempo-

ral, or are they heavenly? Let Moses reply: "And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that the Lord thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth: and all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God. Blessed shalt thou be in the city, and blessed shalt thou be in the field. Blessed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy ground, and the fruit of thy cattle, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep. Blessed shall be thy basket and thy store. Blessed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and blessed shalt thou be when thou goest out. The Lord shall command the blessing upon thee in thy storehouses, and in all that thou settest thine hand unto; and he shall bless thee in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee. The Lord shall establish thee a holy people unto himself, as he hath sworn unto thee, if thou shall keep the commandments of the Lord thy God, and walk in his ways. And all people of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of the Lord; and they shall be afraid of thee. And the Lord shall make thee plenteous in goods, in the fruit of thy body, and in the fruit of thy cattle, and in the fruit of thy ground, in the land which the Lord sware unto thy fathers to give thee. The Lord shall open unto thee his good treasure, the heaven to give thee rain unto thy land in his season, and to bless all the work of thine hand: and thou shalt lend unto many nations, and thou shalt not borrow."

So much for the blessings. We find they are altogether temporal in their nature; and the Jews in the covenant accepted these terms, and of course could not, under the contract, ask for more than its terms proposed. These blessings were vouchsafed to them on condition of obedience. Their disobedience to the statutes—a failure to do all the judgments and ordinances delivered to them through Moses, were to be followed by curses precisely the reverse of the blessings. To a part of these we now direct our especial attention—the law contained only a *shadow* of the good things to come—it also contained a shadow of the evils which are to come. Without running into a minute analysis of the various curses denounced upon the disobedient, we shall now only refer to two great national calamities promised. The first is in these words: "The fruit of thy land, and all thy labors, shall a nation which thou knowest not eat up; and thou shalt be only oppressed and crushed alway: so that thou shalt be mad for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see. The Lord shall smite thee in the knees, and in the legs, with a sore botch that cannot be healed, from the sole of the foot unto the top of the head. The Lord shall bring thee, and thy king which thou shalt set over thee, unto a nation which neither thou nor thy fathers have known; and there shalt thou serve other gods, wood and stone, and thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb, and a bye-word, among all nations whither the Lord shall lead thee. Thou shalt beget sons and daughters, but thou shalt not enjoy them; for they shall go into captivity. Moreover, all these curses shall come upon thee, and shall pursue thee, and overtake thee, till thou be destroyed; because thou hearkenedst not unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which he commanded thee: and they shall be upon thee for a sign and for a wonder, and upon thy seed forever." We have here a full and concise description of the captivity of the Jews among the Babylonians; its faithfulness in every particular is well attested in the records of the nation. In this calamity, the nation, *and the king which it had set over it*, were participants. Hence we have a clue to the period of the accomplishment of the prophecy. But two captivities were denounced—but two have taken place—the first one in the reign of King Zedekiah, when both himself and people were led away slaves to the king of Babylon. The second one, to be accomplished many years after the termination of the first, more nearly concerns our present inquiry, and it is denounced in the following words: "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth; a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand; a nation of fierce countenance, which shall

Digitized by Google

not regard the person of the old, nor show favor to the young. And *he shall besiege thee in all thy gates, until thy high and fenced walls come down, wherein thou trustedst, throughout all thy land:* and he shall besiege thee in all thy gates throughout all thy land, which the Lord thy God hath given thee. And thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own body, the flesh of thy sons and of thy daughters, which the Lord thy God hath given thee, in the siege, and in the straitness, wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee. And toward her young one that cometh out from between her feet, and toward her children which she shall bear: for she shall eat them for want of all things secretly in the siege and straitness wherewith thine enemy shall distress thee in thy gates. And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone. And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest: but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind: and thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear day and night, and shalt have none assurance of thy life." Such are part of the promised curses which were to follow the following item in the contrast: "If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD." These are the words of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel, in the land of Moab. The one made in Horeb does not ascend above the promises of this one.

We have now a clue to the impending vengeance proclaimed by John the Immerser; for the law reigned until Christ, *through the cross*, abolished by his flesh the enmity—the law of the commandments concerning ordinances. All its sacrifices, its statutes, ordinances, promises, and blessings, and cursings stood, until the Messiah expired on the tree. The night before his crucifixion he kept with his disciples the commemorative institution of the Passover, thus acknowledging the continuance of the force of its statutes. Throughout his personal ministry he yielded obedience to its requisitions; and as it existed in full force, its denunciations are those which John proclaimed to the assembled multitudes on the banks of the Jordan and in the wilderness of Judea. Having our chain stretched from the plains of Moab to the river Jordan, we can be at no loss in defining the nature of the threatened vengeance and the promised salvation. They were both temporal. We christians cannot conceive of any greater punishment than that contained in the mandate, "Depart, ye accursed, into *everlasting* flames, prepared for the devil and his angels;" nor can the utmost stretch of the most comprehensive mind imagine a greater state of bliss than that contained in the declaration of the King to those on his right hand—"Come, you blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the formation of the world." Why? *Because we have not been taught a higher condition of things in our institution.* What right have we then to suppose the Jews could know any thing about a system of things which never had been taught to them? How could they look for immortality—for an unfading inheritance, when they never had been promised such a thing? Nor could they look for eternal punishment for their transgressions of the law of Moses, from the simple fact that no such punishment is promised. Temporal calamities were the penalties of the law; and having seen that the first captivity promised was inflicted on the nation, just as it was promised by Moses for its disobedience, notwithstanding all the prophetic warnings of Jeremiah, Isaiah, and the other teachers of the period, we shall now turn our eyes to the "impending vengeance" promised by the lawgiver, and reiterated both by John and the Messiah.

Now let us bear in mind the fact that God never did promise this nation eternal life as a consequence of obedience to the law, nor did he threaten it with eternal punishment for disobedience—and we err greatly in running the dispensations into each other. The Jewish Prophets had a two-fold office to perform—to promise and predict curses and blessings for the future—and

Digitized by Google

they were also instructers of the people in the law. A great portion of their labors was designed to reform the lawless race, to whom they were sent, and to bring them back to the Mosaic requisitions of obedience. In this work we find them threatening the same things which Moses had promised should come upon them if they forsook the holy commandments given them by Jehovah himself. *These Prophets denounced the same judgments against the disobedient that Moses did.* They never went beyond what he had promised to the obedient and disobedient, in their addresses to these two classes of people, on the principle that a stream can never rise higher than its fountain. As long as the dispensation of Moses was in existence, its requirements were to be fulfilled—its blessings enjoyed—its curses received. This position will not be controverted, we are persuaded, and we now pass to a closer review of the subject.

In the extracts from Moses we showed that two captivities were promised this people for their sins. The first one took place in the reign of Zedekiah, king of Judea. All the attendant circumstances upon that captivity, detailed with singular minuteness by Moses, were again and again reiterated in the ears of the descendants of those who heard Moses by the Prophets of the day. The power of Babylon came upon the stubborn, disobedient race, like a flood, and swept it from the land. Not one of the threatened curses failed in fearful accomplishment. After seventy years they returned from Babylon, completely cured of idolatry, and once more entered into possession of the gift to Abraham. But again they apostatized—they forsook the laws of their King—rebelled against his authority—run into all kinds of disgraceful and excessive iniquity—neglected the teachings of the law, and turned a deaf ear to the admonitions of the divinely authorized instructers. What now was to be done? What punishment was the people now to receive? The most fearful one they had yet suffered was the only one reserved for them. The destruction of their country, and their long, long night of captivity, with all its miseries and sorrows, was yet in the hands of their Messiah and righteous Judge. It remained to be seen whether the nation would accept deliverance from the only "vengeance" yet to be accomplished, or whether it would reject the overtures for reconciliation, and bring upon themselves and posterity the curse so long delayed. A long line of Prophets from Moses to John, had set before them, in living colors, the blessings of obedience to the law, and the curses that would attend a departure from its just and holy commandments. The history of the nation throughout this long period of time shows how literally and completely all things promised were accomplished. Not a jot or tittle had yet failed; and the last illustrious teacher sent to this stubborn, lawless race, declared with emphasis that not one should fail in accomplishing its full design.

We, therefore, have a clue to the impending vengeance spoken of by John the Immerser on the banks of the Jordan. Who has warned you Jews to escape the vengeance hanging over you—the vengeance spoken of by Moses and by all the Prophets? The axe is laid at the root of your trees: every tree that bringeth forth not good fruit is felled and turned into fuel. I immerse you in water, but there stands one among you, to whom all the Prophets point, who will immerse in the Holy Spirit and fire. He will immerse the trees which produce good fruit, in the Holy Spirit; but those which do not—those which are felled and turned into fuel, shall be immersed or overwhelmed in fire. His winnowing shovel is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his grain—(the Jewish nation was this grain)—he will gather his wheat into the granary, and consume the chaff in unquenchable fire. The good fruit, the wheat, could only grow in the fields laid out by Moses. He had sowed the seed; and as long as his dispensation existed his requisitions were to be fulfilled, his promised blessings enjoyed, his threatened curses received. A new dispensation was about to be developed; but every thing in its own order. This one was to stand on better promises than that of Moses; but the institution could not grow—the superstructure could not be raised until the foundation was laid. But this by the way until a more fitting season. As the Mosaic dispensation was still in force at the appearance of John and Jesus Christ,

Digitized by Google

they were both teachers of the law. They did not teach the Jews to apostatize from it: they never hinted to them that it was abrogated; but taught the people to obey it—to forsake or apostatize from their traditions and creeds, and return to the things commanded in the institution set up at Sinai. The rejection of this teaching was to close the door against them—they would not be permitted to dwell in Palestine any longer—their city should be taken from them and trodden down by the Gentiles—their temple razed to the ground, and not one stone left standing on another—the tribes scattered over the whole face of the earth—sorrows and miseries of the most harrowing description were to attend them. Every word spoken by Moses in his valedictory address should be fully accomplished. "The long suffering of God had borne with these children of wrath, fitted [by their transgressions] to destruction;" but the day of vengeance was at hand. If they reformed, what should follow? Eternal life? No; the law had never made a promise of that kind: but if they returned to the Lord—if they should again perform the obedience required by the Lord—if they should again perform the obedience required by the law, temporal blessings in abundance were promised. The "windows of heaven were to open, and a blessing poured out, so large that there should not be room enough to hold it." Mal. iii. 10. "The devourer shall be rebuked for your sakes, and *he shall not destroy the fruits of your ground*, neither shall your vine cast her fruit before the time in the field. You shall be a delightsome land, saith the Lord of hosts." But if they should not reform, Malachi, long before John, preaches an immersion of fire: "For behold the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that no wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." This is for the wicked —the apostate Jews. But for those who should return, the same Prophet declares that "the Sun of Righteousness should arise with healing in his wings; and you [reformed Jews] shall go forth as calves of the stall. And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts." Here follows the rule of measurement—the standard, by which these two classes were to be tried—the apostates and the reformed servants of the Lord: "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb, *with the statutes and judgments.*" It was no difficult matter, therefore, for these people to *know* when they were safe, and when they were in danger. By referring to the law of Moses they could easily find out what was required, and ascertain the blessing annexed to each command, and the curse threatened for each disobedience. Unfortunately for them, they had rejected this standard—they fought fiercely for the name of Moses, but his principles were disregarded. Their *creeds* were their standards—they remembered them, instead of the law of Moses; and these little "summaries" of the law acted as a veil to prevent them from returning to the law. They refused to give up their creeds—they fought manfully for them, in opposition to the teachings of John and the Messiah; but their forsaking the law did not prevent its full tide of vengeance from coming on them. It invited the baptism of fire. The *premonitions* of this day of vengeance were detailed by the same Prophet: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord: and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse."

Thus fully warned of the whole matter, they were left without excuse—there was no cloak for their ignorance. But enough for the present; we shall examine this subject still farther after the lapse of another month.

T. S. B.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

Digitized by Google

Letters from A. Campbell to Elder W. Jones.

Letter VII.

TO the aged and venerable brother Jones, favor, mercy, and peace be multiplied!

It gives me pleasure, my very learned and respected brother, to observe the frankness and fulness with which you animadvert on such matters in my writings as happen not to coincide with your modes of thinking and reasoning on some popular items of the philosophy of modern christianity. This admonishes and authorizes me to be equally frank and full in my expositions of these matters, to you of doubtful evidence, and in inviting your attention to the weightier matters of the religion, to the restoration of which, in its primitive purity and excellency, we are supremely devoted; and in which enterprize we have been fellow-laborers in different parts of the great vineyard of the Lord of hosts, according to our respective gifts and opportunities.

A first principle with us, (and it is the only redeeming principle that can save the world from the ignorance, infatuation, and tyranny of human tradition) is, "To bring all things to the test," and then "to hold fast that which is good" and true: for whatever is true in religion or morality, is good; and nothing can be good which is not true. We are, therefore, no more than consistent with ourselves, when we freely and candidly canvass each other's sentiments and opinions.

So much of one faith, one hope, one baptism, and one spirit, if we have any thing to debate, it must be something either wholly out of the Record, or very circuitously and remotely inferred from it. Such are the questions which constituted the burthen of your May and June letters. True, indeed, that "the law," and lawful use of the law, under the christian covenant, as well as "the Holy Spirit" and its influence in sanctifying and saving the world, are subjects propounded in the apostolic epistles: but the questions now in debate on these subjects, are found rather among the traditions of the elders, than in the writings of the Apostles; and belong much more to speculative and scholastic theology, than to the elements of the gospel, or the worship of the christian church. By some badly educated christians they are considered the chief essentials of the Christian Institution; and, perhaps, on this account may merit a very passing and slight notice; but never can deserve a place in the bond of union, nor amongst the terms of communion, in a congregation of christians built upon the foundation of Apostles and Prophets.

It may be courteous, indeed, and highly respectful to public opinion, that you should at this crisis select these topics rather than urge upon the English public the greater matters which we are now pressing upon our fellow-citizens in the American States, and which are destined to undermine and subvert the doctrines and commandments of men, to make an end of the jargon and strife occasioned by the one

Digitized by Google

thousand stale questions of dry, old-fashioned, polemic divinity; and to dissipate the countless "fables" not merely of "old wives," but of men more womanish than they; who have converted the christtan religion into fits and freaks of passion and feeling, and the enthusiastic rhapsodies of unrestrained imagination.

The elements of the gospel of salvation—the order and worship of the christian congregations—the proper way of preaching Christ in order to the conversion of the world—and the most likely means to convert the christians scattered through the sects, from sectarianism to original christianity—are the present topics of discussion, and the great arguments to rectify public opinion, and to introduce a better order of society. But, in the meantime, you have invited me to reconsider an essay in the *Christian Baptist* on "the Law," from a conviction that there is some latent error in it; and decorum says that to this I should now carefully attend.

I could now wish that I had sent you a Sermon on the Law, which I pronounced in the year 1816, to a Baptist Association. It has been out of print for some time, and indeed I do not know that I have a single copy of it in its original form. It goes more fully into your difficulties than the Essay from which you make the extracts in your June letter.

You are surprized to find me, on this one point, in the camp of the hypercalvinists, while opposing the hypercalvinism of the Scotch Baptists. As you proceed in the volumes of the *Christian Baptist* you will find other instances of my agreeing in certain dogmata with the most belligerent parties in christendom; but not with two opposing parties on the same positions. All parties sometimes rightfully claim Paul, although he belongs not to any one of them. A person who contends for the original faith only, and follows in a straight line the Apostles, will often find himself crossing the crooked lines which separate hostile sects, and sometimes sojourning for a night on this side and on that of the long disputed barriers of antagonist creeds.

Paul is occasionally found in company with the Methodists and sometimes with the Calvinists—now with this party, and again with that. Paul, however, never changes. Find him in whatever company we may, we find him always consistent with himself. I am, therefore, never ashamed of such good company, in whatever party I may find it. Neither is my attachment nor my allegiance to any party so great as to induce me to hold with it when it deserts my Apostle Paul.

But to come at once to the point: While I admit not only the possibility, but the probability—and, in some instances, even the certainty, that, like all the sons of men, I have erred in doctrine as well as in practice, and may have done so more frequently than I have detected myself; and while I may, in the instance before us, have unhappily expressed myself, or overlooked some consideration which strikes you with peculiar force—still I am constrained, from the most mature reflection and reconsideration, to re-affirm my former positions and allegata on this subject.

Digitized by Google

Your very eloquent and apposite descriptions of the nobility of mind requisite to the candid concession of a mistake—your making it appear so honorable, and amiable, and noble to acknowledge an error, almost constrain regret, on my part, that I cannot do myself the honor to say, that, in my remarks upon the law of Moses, I discover myself in error. Nor do I think that you are mistaken as to your practical conclusions on the true import and design of the legal dispensation; nor even of what is properly called *the moral law.*

The consequences which you suggest to me as naturally flowing from my views of the Decalogue, have never been realized by those who cordially agree with me in sentiment on this subject. In affirming that Moses is not our lawgiver, as he was Israel's, it does not follow that "he has no claims upon us for obedience," and "we are at perfect liberty to disregard, despise, reject, or renounce him." Paul affirms that christians "are not under the law." Shall we thence infer that they are in danger of despising Moses and his law! Sacrifices and oblations according to the ritual have ceased, and are set aside. Must we, then, despise, reject, and disregard the institutions of the Law? This does not, in my judgment, follow.

But to be more methodical: After a very liberal extract from vol. 1, page 111, 1st ed. of *Christian Baptist*, on which you make some highly commendatory remarks, you relate an excellent anecdote of a very surly mathematician of the name of Vince, whose judgment, it appears, was never to be led captive by the charms of eloquence or oratory. The question, "*What does this prove*," is rarely out of place when we read or listen to any thing scientific, moral, or religious. Were I not too much after the model of this Mr. Vince, I would, after the very flattering and handsome manner in which you have expressed yourself on the aforesaid extract, have been firmly and fully convinced of error somewhere in my reasonings upon the law. But with this most apposite and instructive anecdote in my view, for which I tender you a hundred thanks, I must not be charmed by *your* most felicitous style and kind expressions, into the suspicion that I have not proved that the law of ten commands is not *the rule of life* to christians.

Had you only quoted the previous page, you would have found *five* reasons that might have satisfied Mr. Vince himself that the popular divisions of the law, and the reasonings built thereupon are fallacious. Besides, you have left out one entire section in the midst of the aforesaid extract, that would have given Mr. Vince, and such logicians, something to think of; in which we show that we have as much reason to submit to Aaron as to Moses—to the Jewish High Priest as to the Jewish Lawgiver.

This you did, I doubt not, for the sake of connecting those parts—the most acceptable to your readers and yourself—and not from any design to keep back a part of the argument. Indeed, the passage quoted was never intended for Mr. Vince, or any person *invincible* to that species of illustration and argument indirect—couched in the

Digitized by Google

quotations you have made, it was designed either as an anticipation of objections, or a reply to some that were expected.

Again, in the next number of the *Christian Baptist*, vol. 1, p. 120, you have other arguments for such reasoners as Mr. Vince, on the same question—though the subject there is the Sabbath day and the Lord's day. The arguments found in these two articles, in my judgment, had you happened to have observed them with your usual discrimination, would have removed all the objections found in your June favor lying before me.

These documents have satisfied our American readers on all the objections which have occurred to you, so far as you have stated them in the preceding letter; and I trust will be equally convincing to your English readers, should you think the question of such merit as to call for a publication in that country of our whole argument on that question.

I recollect some years since, when reading M'Lean on the Commission (a work of great clearness and force of argument,) I was not a little surprized to find him in the hackneyed notion of the law "not now as a *covenant of works*," but as "*a rule of life*" to christians—in the very face of the Commission, which said, "Teach them to observe and do whatever *I* command you."

Was the law of ten commands ever a covenant of works in order to eternal life, in Paradise or out of it—in Canaan or in the wilderness—to Jew or Gentile, Samaritan or Christian?—! No: never! It was not promulged for almost one thousand years after the Flood.

Can the ten precepts be the standard of holiness to all the moral universe? Does not the Messiah say there are two precepts, principles or laws of the moral empire, which include much more than the Decalogue? These two are, in my judgment, the standard of purity and holiness in heaven and earth, throughout all intelligent and responsible creation. I repeat, they are much more comprehensive than the ten commandments: for, says our great Prophet, "ON THESE TWO HANG ALL THE LAW AND ALL THE PROPHETS"—"*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbor* [or fellow-citizen] *as thyself.*"

If there be a fallacy in my reasonings upon this subject, I shall be most thankful to him who will show it me. I never understood Old or New Testament while I regarded my "catechism" about this law as "a covenant of works," promising eternal life on condition of "perfect and perpetual obedience," equally addressed to, and binding upon all mankind. Nor could I esteem it "a rule of life to christians," when Paul told them they "were not under the law, but under Christ." "For the law was given by Moses, but the favor and the reality came by Jesus the Christ." No precept of the ten forbids fornication; no precept of the ten forbids polygamy; no precept of the ten forbids slavery, but the tenth rather sanctions it. It places my "neighbor's servant, ox, and ass" in one and the same provision.

Digitized by Google

Again, it commands not the observance of "a seventh part of time," but "*the seventh day* as *the Sabbath* of the Lord," because of the completion of creation; and, therefore, the observance of the first day never can be a substitute for it.

On this matter, brother Jones, I *feel* very strong, because I have been tempted on all sides, by all sorts of spirits, living and dead, weak and strong, learned and unlearned, on this question; and though as open to conviction as a child, all that I have read and heard only confirms me that there is a great fallacy in the whole science called Scholastic Theology, whether taught in England or in Scotland, on the true intent and meaning of the whole Jewish Economy. "The veil" is yet on the eyes of almost all the Protestants, as well as the Romanists and Jews, "in reading the Old Testament." I have found that the Scotch Baptists in America have generally learned the Catechism before they studied either Moses or Paul on the law and the covenants.

Pardon me, my very venerable brother, for propounding a few questions on your three last considerations, which I propose in order that you may feel the difficulties in my way insuperable to an acquiescence in the popular doctrine.—

1. Are the ten precepts a transcript of the divine perfections, as is usually taught? If so, in what precept does the love, or mercy, or compassion, or condescension, or truth, or long suffering, &c. &c. of God appear?

2. Were the ten precepts written in the heart of Adam, or the great principles which are only in part developed in the ten words? Could Adam, while in Eden, covet his neighbor's wife, servant, ox, or ass?

3. Would it not appear that there was sin in the world before *this* law was promulged or written any where, inasmuch as in every commandment there is a *prohibition* of some specified sin already known and defined?

4. Some make the Decalogue coeval with time, and regard it as promulged on the creation of man; hence they speak of God's writing it upon two tables of stone at Sinai, as if it were some new edition of it. Does not the first period of your second consideration countenance this idea?

5. Where does Paul give it a two-fold aspect, distinguished by him into flesh and spirit, or letter and spirit?

6. Do not *letter* and *spirit* (2 Cor. iii.) denote law and gospel; as when Paul says, "The letter kills, the spirit makes alive"?

7. You say, "It is only *as forming a part of the old covenant* that we can consider it as no longer binding on Gentile Christians." Did it ever form a part of any other covenant; or was it ever binding on Gentile Christians as a rule of life?

8. When and where did the law ever "promise eternal life upon condition of perfect obedience"?

9. How could it be the condition of national felicity and the condition of eternal life?—A rule of life to make a man prosperous on earth and happy in heaven!

Digitized by Google

10. Is the law to be preached now to convince the world of sin?

11. Does not the Spirit convince the world of sin, because of their unbelief in Jesus as the Messiah? Of righteousness, because of Christ's justification in heaven, and not by the Decalogue.

12. Does Matth. v. 17–20. *establish* the Decalogue as the rule of christian life? Does not that passage refer to the Prophets and all the types as well as to the Decalogue? Did not Jesus fulfil "the ceremonial" as well as "the moral" part of that institution?

13. Did not Paul, in all his epistles, teach the Jews and Gentiles, that, under Christ, they were not under the law? Rom. vii. 1–6. and vi. 14. assert this in the clearest and most positive terms.

These questions only suggest some of the embarrassments which arise from the popular notion of the Decalogue as the standard of christian character and christian excellence—as the rule of life for the disciples of Christ.

You will observe, my dear brother Jones, that I secure all you can demand, by regarding the two great laws as the supreme law of the moral empire, of immutable and eternal obligation, as having all the law of Moses, moral, ceremonial, and judicial, hanging upon them; as the parchments of the Law and the Prophets hung on two pins in the Jews' synagogues.

The ten commands display but one modification or dispensation of these two fundamental principles; and yet do not, by any means, unfold *all* the morality and piety found in these two. I say, then, we secure all, and lose nothing in taking the decision of the Messiah on this question as final, and risking the rejection of the popular notion of the Decalogue as a perfect rule of life for christians. It is perfect as far as it goes; but it goes not far enough for our Lawgiver. His Sermon on the Mount carries out the precepts much farther than expressed on Sinai, and he adds to them precepts wholly new.

Which of the ten precepts commands the overcoming of evil with good; enjoins the forgiveness of trespasses; enforces humility, and obliges to acts of mercy and compassion! And yet they are the rule of life for christians!!

Durham's 4to on the Ten Commands finds every thing in the old covenant that there is in the new; just as Peter D'Alvo found all miracles and mysteries in the conception of Jesus; or as John Gill could find in the parable of the Good Samaritan the whole Christian Institution.

True, indeed, that Paul says, "Thou shalt not steal: thou shalt not bear false witness," &c. "and if there be any other commandment" of this sort it is all comprehended in loving one's neighbor as one self; and therefore love is the fulfilling of all law—that of Moses and that of Christ—even his *new* commandment; but this is quite a different matter from making that law the perfect rule of life for christians which not once mentions love to our neighbor.

Besides, on the popular hypothesis, it is impossible to find in the fourth commandment the Lord's day institution. The Christian Institution calls for the *first* day, for one reason; the Jewish for the *seventh* for another; neither of them for "*a seventh part of time.*"

But I will not again, or now at least, argue this matter out. I honor Moses, but I honor Christ more; a Son over his own house; not a servant in another person's family. I greatly value the legal dispensation, and positively inculcate all the religion and morality found in the Decalogue; but I do not stop there. We go for a new dispensation of the two precepts, to the utmost extent of their meaning, in adaptation to the gospel and human circumstances. We have a better covenant, a better Mediator, better promises, and a better law than had the twelve tribes.

I beseech you, my venerable and much esteemed brother, to bear in mind while you read this, that it is not a methodical essay, but a desultory letter; that it is from a pen, however dogmatical in appearance and from habit, which is guided by a heart that admires and esteems the wisdom and learning of age, when associated with goodness of disposition, and that greatly prefers to accord with the whole views and sentiments of a brother or fellow-citizen, than to dissent even in the mint, anise, and dill of the most speculative opinions on any question of religion and morality. For the reasons already offered, if you see not adequate grounds for a change of opinion on this question, you will doubtless find for me a sufficient apology for the effort I have made to rectify public opinion not wholly speculative, but somewhat practical; and which has, as if by some tacit league and covenant, been taken for granted by many of our reformers, both of the Papacy and of the Prelacy, and of the Puritanism of Old and New England, as a matter not to be disputed more than the divine mission of Moses or of Jesus.

It will still increase the satisfaction which I enjoy in my correspondence with you, to discover that neither a difference of opinion, nor pertinacity in contending for it, can in the least alienate your affection from one who agrees with you in the thousands and only differs in the *thousandths*.

As ever, &c.

A. CAMPBELL.

Ancient Order of Things at Geneva.

From Mrs. Sherwood's "Sabbaths on the Continent."

SUNDAYS AT GENEVA.

GENEVA, SUNDAY THE FIRST.

WE began to prepare ourselves for the afternoon service, exulting in the idea that the bells were now speaking a language to which we might venture to attend; for, as I said to my son, "They are Protestants here. The church was established by Calvin, whose doctrines agree in all important points with the articles of our church, and I think we have picked up quite French enough to understand what we hear." We had bespoken a *laquais de place*, and the old man had been in

Digitized by Google

waiting since the morning; neither was he out of the way when we happened to want him, and away we set off, threading what appeared to us a sort of under ground labyrinth, always ascending in the direction of the cathedral.

We paused not to examine the edifice, but pressed on with the people who were passing through the doors into the church, and having obtained convenient seats we were prepared to be edified by some exhibition of pure doctrine, from the pulpit in which Calvin in ages past had so successfully brought the artillery of truth to bear against the errors of Popery. We listened earnestly, and it required much attention to enable us thoroughly to understand each part of a discourse, not only delivered in a foreign language, but in a foreign manner; for the preachers on the continent use much action, delivering themselves in the style which we should account theatrical, and giving a strong nasal sound to many of their words: a very fixed attention, therefore, as I said before, was necessary to enable us to understand the discourse; and it appeared to us, when it was concluded, that all we could hope to derive from the exercise, was some small improvement in the French language, inasmuch as so far as we could understand, not a single reference from first to last was made by the preacher to any doctrinal truth. There was neither milk for babes nor strong meat for elders, but a pompous and parading flourish respecting the beauty of virtue, and the degradation produced by a vicious course of life; but we had learned a little wisdom at Dijon, and were afraid of making any remarks, even in our own language, whilst mingled with the crowd in coming out of the church, lest some one should turn upon us and ask if we had never by chance been fed in the same way with husks from an English pulpit.

GENEVA, SUNDAY THE SECOND.

It is painful on some occasions to be obliged to speak the truth. It is not in the established church of Geneva that the word of God is now exhibited; but there are several small chapels, the ministers of which have left the establishment, where it is preached with the utmost simplicity. I must refrain from mentioning names, even in speaking well; but we attended two of these places of worship—the one in the morning, where the congregation were collected in a small upper chamber in an obscure house: here were assembled poor, humble persons, chiefly laboring men and women, wearing large round straw hats. The minister read a chapter, and then one and another of the elders of the congregation got up and spoke upon it. After the reading and prayers, the Lord's supper was administered, the elders passing the elements to the people as they sat in their places. I never saw more seriousness, decency, or simplicity; I could have fancied myself in an assembly of primitive christians, in the times of persecution. But this, no doubt, is certain, that where piety is not honorable, and some degree of contempt is thrown upon professors, congregations will be more pure, than under other circumstances. Where religion wears her silver slippers, there are many that will love to walk with her in the streets. [*Episcopal Recorder, October* 10.]

Digitized by Google

THE EFFECTS OF GOOD TEACHING.

THE following instructive epistle is confirmatory of much abstract reasoning on the influence of good order in a christian community. But, by way of prevention of unwarrantable inferences from such premises, be it observed, that this good order is itself the effect of good teaching; and that had it not been for both preaching and teaching Christ, in word as well as in deed, by an excellent *ministry* in said church, its increase and growth would not have been more rapid the last two or three years than it was the ten years antecedent. The church in Baltimore has now more teaching and preaching Christ, and more persons fit for such services, than can be found in some ten or a dozen of the country churches. Thinking people will not resort to any place where they cannot be edified; and the means of edification in said church are now superabundant.——ED. M. H.

BALTIMORE, *Md.* June 16, 1835.

Dear Friend—Yours of the 10th has come to hand; in it you have matter of much importance for consideration. I shall not pass it by unnoticed, but give it that attention of which my mind is capable. You mention the names of certain brethren who have visited us from your state, and who were much delighted with the order they beheld in our midst: but, dear brother, when you recollect that we have been together twenty-five years, it will be seen that so much praise is not our due. We are in a state of peace, and enjoy much comfort in our intercourse, both social and separate. This may flow from the knowledge which has been acquired from the WORD OF GOD, and *the experience of years;* for, in our early history, which is much chequered, we had many ups and downs. Our continuance at times was often expected not to last a month. When we came out from the Baptist Church we had no other view than serving the Baptist cause, and we were full of Baptist pride. We commenced with an able teacher, whose knowledge of the Scriptures was more than common. Our attention was led to them (the Scriptures) more than heretofore; and when we began to see that the Word ought to work effectually in us as it did in those who believed in ancient times, a great revolution both in thought and practice was the consequence. Just as we began to get right our teacher was put away, and many who had joined us entirely left us, being bereaved of the great source of their joy; so that from fifty or more, we were reduced to five, and they feeble folk indeed. Yet this preserved the candle from going out entirely; only it had burned down to the socket, and the wick flaring in the side instead of upright. The attachment of those who left to the teacher was evident; when he no longer exercised his talents, they showed that they had consented to the practice of things on his account, without previous examination; for many of them never met again. Some few after a time did return, for they had gained so much knowledge of the Scriptures as not to be at home elsewhere. For the last twenty years, we have had but little or no instruction but from the Bible: our attachment has not been to so much preaching from those called "*clergymen.*" We have endeavored to instruct and exhort one another. Hence our meetings have not been so inviting to the world. When

Digitized by Google

any visited us, they saw men of common talents, accustomed to mix with them in the common business of life; they saw men and women who had come together into one place to worship the God of all grace and mercy, in the name of his Son Jesus Christ, according to his appointments, and with his laws in their hands. Hence there was nothing inviting to the man of the world; and our congregation, therefore, much smaller than the church.*

We are continually upon the increase, and I sometimes am at a loss where the people come from. A man drops in one Lord's day, never, perhaps, with us before; next time, probably, he will bring his Bible, and see if the (to him) strange unheard of things he hears are really so; and the third time he will apply for immersion, by which he generally gives offence to his relatives. But opposition proves of no use. No means have been used to excite his passions, nor any persuasion by the brethren; only the reading of the Scriptures has caused his judgment to be exercised, and he acts accordingly. Well, what follows? His wife, his sister, his mother, or some of his relatives, may be two or three come with him to this strange place, where there is no stated preacher or clergyman, but only some plain, common men, calling the attention of all present to the *practice* of the word of God. And what is the effect of these relatives, accompanying their once-thought-deluded husband, or brother, &c. Just the same as in his own case. They have heard for themselves, *and they obey*. I am fully persuaded, if the churches in the Restoration were not to have so much aid from public speakers, but take the Book for themselves, they would, in a short time, have some of the male members capable of instructing those without to profit, and be of much use within. But the help they look for from others superinduces indolence in themselves; and as long as that hunger for preaching predominates, the churches cannot be in health. Set them to making bargains for merchandize, as farmers, &c. and see how fluent they become—no loss for words then: O no! every one is then as quick as thought; but the profit of the souls of men cannot move them to qualify themselves with the word of God in their hands to point out the way which he has appointed for the salvation of men. I do not expect they should all be a Dr. ——; no such thing: no, but I know, from experience, that any who can read and think can tell others what he has been reading and thinking of the great salvation. My dear friend, the fact is, they do not lay the matter to heart. They seem to think the work must be done by some specially called and sent, or it will not, cannot be done. If this latter be not fully expressed, is it not clearly implied? I am sorry to see and hear so much application for preachers. Our brother Scott had a note to one of his pieces in the Evangelist last year; it was to this effect:—A young man came to a certain place in Ohio; he was invited to preach, which he did. After he had done an old man inquired from whence he was.

* *Church and congregation are synonymous terms. I only use them in the ordinary speech of the world, to discriminate the spectators of our worship from the true worshippers themselves.*

Digitized by Google

"From Deerfield" was the reply. Shortly after, two more, from the same place, preached. The old man made the same inquiry; and the same answer was returned. By and by, three or four young men came from the same place in company. The old gentleman, still anxious to know where these strangers were from, received the same answer, that they came from Deerfield. "Why," says he, "how many preachers have you in Deerfield." They answered, "Sixty!" The application is easy.

Yes, my dear brother, the influence of these causes is one of the principal reasons of the truth not spreading; nor will it be removed till the disciples are in earnest, and determined to exercise what talents they may possess to the best of their ability. Will God not be worshipped acceptably, if men and women come together on the first day of the week with their hearts alive to those things they have convened to do? And if they can only read the Scriptures, offer prayer and praise to God, and commemorate the death of their Lord and Master—will they not have the consolation, and satisfaction too, that they had done what they could? And nothing more is required of them.

Yours in love, W. CARMAN.

Elder William Ballantine.

PHILADELPHIA, May 26, 1835.

Dear brother Campbell,

I AM requested by a number of the church in this place to forward you the following letters for publication, if you accord with us in the hope that the same will, by the divine favor, promote the edification and comfort of the disciples of our dear Lord.

Yours in christian love,

HENRY GREW.

Copy of a Letter from the Church in Somerset, Penn. to William Ballantine.

SOMERSET, May 15th, 1835.

Dear Brother,

The favor of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you, dearly beloved in the Lord:

The church at Somerset have heard, with unfeigned regret, of the illness of one to whom we are united by the strongest ties—those of the gospel. We need scarcely say, that, to you, our attachment has not been of an ordinary character. We feel a relationship existing between us, to which all but christians are strangers. To us you have been both a father and brother. As a father in Israel and an able instructer in the will and ways of the Lord, we have looked up to you with that reverence and respect which exalted talents, meekly and humbly exerted in the cause of our divine Master, are calculated to

Digitized by Google

excite in children for a beloved parent. As a brother, we feel honored to be connected with you; and our greatest joy and crown of rejoicing is, that, with you, we are joint heirs in the rich inheritance of eternal life. In your light afflictions, which can endure but for a short season, we sympathize with you; but we bless our heavenly Father that, in thus laying you low, he has brought you more nearly within reach of that crown of life, the object of all your cares, the consummation of all your hopes. We cannot, it is true, properly appreciate the heavenly joys of one whose hopes are so nearly merged in fruition; but we would not recall you, if we could, from those bright scenes on which your spirit soon must enter. No! if we could, we would not deny you the glorious joy of being like Jesus and seeing him as he is. Long, dear brother, will we rejoice in the recollection of our pleasing, profitable intercourse with you here; and when you shall be numbered amongst the glorious throng of the redeemed in heaven, we, whom you may have left below, will joy to remember the parental admonitions and brotherly exhortations of our triumphantly arisen friend. If God, in his mercy and kindness to your friends and the church, should see fit to prolong your stay on earth for a time, dear brother, make the welfare of this little church and her spiritual health and growth the subject of your prayers. Though we had for a season permitted apathy to abate our exertions in the cause of truth, we now are permitted to indulge the comfortable hope that there is yet good in store for us, and that we shall yet be instrumental in spreading the truth and recommending the gospel to the world around us.

And now, dear brother, if we should never again hear from you, or see your face in the flesh, we bid you an affectionate fraternal farewell; and may he who has safely guided *you* through the journey of life, and, at its close, unfolded to you the joys of heaven, safely guide *us* through *our* weary pilgrimage, and ultimately in heaven place us side by side with our beloved brother Ballantine. And all the glory of our salvation we will ascribe to God and the Lamb forever and ever. Amen!

By a unanimous order of the Church,

WM. H. POSTLETHWAITE, *Clerk.*

Copy of the Answer to the above.

CAMDEN, May 24th, 1835.

TO THE CHURCH AT SOMERSET, PA.

Dearly beloved Brethren,

Your late letter to me has filled me with exceeding joy. I was afraid that our labor was in vain, having heard about your dissensions as a church concerning the Masonic question. I was afraid that it had quite disorganized you. Your letter has allayed all my fears. I bless the Lord that your holy zeal has been excited to your own edification and to the truth of the gospel around you. Now, brethren, let nothing turn you aside from the holy commandment de-

Digitized by Google

livered unto you. Continue steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching, in the fellowship, in the breaking of the bread, and of the prayers. I beseech you that at no time you absent yourselves from the commemoration of the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, without the most urgent necessity; and I entreat you, brethren, that you go on to perfection, not laying the foundation of repentance for dead works; but serving the living God; that you come behind in no gift, add to faith fortitude, &c.

Now, brethren, we are hurrying on to eternity. We must soon meet at the judgment seat of Christ, where every one must give an account of himself to God. May your account and mine be with joy, and not with grief. The Lord bless you all, and may you be kept through his power, through the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, unto eternal life.

Yours, in the hope of immortality,

WILLIAM BALLANTINE.

P. S. My ardent affection to brother Forward. I trust, as his name imports, he is *forward* in the work of reformation.

LETTER FROM ELDER W. BALLANTINE TO THE EDITOR.

PHILADELPHIA, July 25, 1835.

Dearly beloved brother Campbell,

I SEIZE a lucid interval in my sick chamber, to tell you how much I rejoice in your progress in the kingdom and grace of our blessed Lord. May the Lord cause you to abound more and more! I am exceedingly rejoiced that my *quondam* co-pastor, beloved *William Jones*, and you have got together. I trust that in Europe and America you will do great things for the kingdom. But I need not say to you, that before, and in the days of Constantine, and since men have forsaken the truth by believing a lie—namely, that God must do something more for them than he has done by the death and resurrection of his beloved Son; they will have it that all he has done by the great facts of the gospel are nothing, a dead letter, till he do something more for them—some supernatural thing, which is to put energy into the gospel. This, they say, he does to some men, and not to others Those that are partakers of the supernatural thing are partakers of what they call special grace—they are the favorites of Heaven, the elect, &c.; but what the Judge of all the earth does with the others, the sects are not agreed—some say one thing—others, another. Now, beloved brother, I need not say unto you beware of this supernatural *something* of the sects. I am bold to say, no man in the kingdom will be led by this *ignis fatuus*. See that our brethren are free from this great error. From it have arisen our dogmas, bodies of divinity, confessions of faith, and clergy great and small.

Digitized by Google

When are you coming to visit this city of brotherly love? Dearly beloved, do remember this place. I cannot invite you to come and see me. When you come I may be unable to see any one, or may have gone to "*the land of the leal.*" But I think the Lord has much people in this city. I know not what the sects are doing, but our congregation, since you were here, has been going on in the most comfortable manner—our elders and deacons doing their duties faithfully, and the brethren loving one another, walking in the fear of the Lord and the comforts of the Holy Spirit.

Why, beloved, do I see the pages of the Harbinger so often blotted with a misnomer, a non-descript, a REFORMED CLERGYMAN? Such a being, I am sure, is not on earth. I have not been in the sun, nor in the moon, nor any of the fixed stars, or even planets, but I judge from analogy—I believe you will find no such being in the whole universe. Rowland Hill used to say, 'If the inhabitants of the moon knew how many Reverends, Right Reverend Fathers in God, and inferior Clergy we had upon the earth, they would be astounded.' REFORMED CLERGYMAN! Pray who is this? A REFORMED CLERGYMAN in the reformation. I beg to know how he got in? Who let him in? He could not get into the kingdom by the door; he must have climbed up some other way. I hope, beloved brother, you did not let him in. I know not where else he is, but I see him in the Harbinger to my grief. I hope never to see him there again. '*Reformed*'! Pray what 'reformation' does this Clergyman mean? He cannot mean the 'reformation' on the day of Pentecost, seeing there were no clergymen there. He cannot mean, surely, the late reformation among us, for we have no clergymen among us. He must mean the 'reformation' by Luther. Well, then, let him go back to Luther; and let him learn that in our Lord's kingdom we are all disciples, brethren, kings, and priests unto our God by the blood of the cross. I am not a bit better pleased with the terms *layman*, *laity*. You are a better etymologist than I am: you will tell your readers whether these words are derived from *laas*, (a stone,) or *laos*, (the people.) But I suppose you know that near the dark ages it was a dispute: the greater part inclined to *laas*, (a stone,) because the people, except the priests, were of a hard and doltish nature. O! my beloved brother, my soul is wrung out in me while I meditate now, on the verge of eternity, on these base clergy and the poor priest-ridden people; and I say of them all, in holy indignation, what the Roman Pontiff said in supercilious pride, when offering sacrifice or incense—*Odi profanum vulgus et arceo!* No, "to the poor the gospel is preached," or 'the poor preach the gospel.' O! had I ten thousand tongues, they should all proclaim to the ends of the earth, "God so loved the world," &c. Brother, I beseech you tell the proclaimers not to become declaimers. I am sorry to hear that some have become declaimers of sects. Let them give themselves to prayer and to the ministry of the word.

My most ardent affection to sister Campbell and beloved family.

WM. BALLANTINE.

Digitized by Google

Re-immersion and Brother Thomas.

IN the *Apostolic Advocate*, of October 1st, we find more than seven pages, small type, (which, were it not for the little room we have at our disposal at present, we should republish,) in vindication of the Editor from the implications of sister "SUSAN," and in defence of his practices in the alleged cases of re-baptism. Not being able to give the two articles *in extenso*, with remarks upon them in the present number, we shall, for the gratification of our readers, make a few quotations, giving a fair view of the matters supposed to be at issue.

"Susan's letter," says our brother Thomas, "charges me with re-baptizing the baptized—a charge which I repel as unfounded." "I admit," continues he, "that I have baptized the immersed, and continue to do so still."

Desirous not to have even the appearance of any dissension or disagreement amongst the advocates of the Apostles' doctrine, should it only be on a question of expediency, having the fullest conviction of the injurious tendency of such an appearance, we will not even discuss the biblical value of the difference between baptizing the baptized and baptizing the immersed. With us baptism is immersion, and immersion is baptism. The one means not immersion with faith, and the other immersion without faith; for they equally mean immersion, with or without faith, so far as either the original tongue or New Testament usage is concerned.

Brother Thomas most fully and unequivocally repudiates the notion of proclaiming immersion for remission to the citizens of the kingdom; and while he censures sister Susan (whom he converts into a brother) for her credulity in believing such a report, and myself as being too credulous in publishing it, he asks for the passage in his writings that affirms such a sentiment. We do not think any person can find such a passage in his writings, and I do not think he ever published such a notion.

While I partially, but not entirely, admit his definition of credulity, (for a person on good authority, without examination, may sometimes believe without the imputation of credulity,) I do not like the very charitable excuse my beloved brother has offered for me, any more than he relishes the compliment of being young and ardent. Youth and ardor are faults, to speak pleasantly, of which a person may naturally be expected to reform every day; but not so of the weakness called credulity!

The reasons of our credulity in the case, were—

1st. Brother Thomas addressed the church in Baltimore, calling upon it (in brief) to re-immerse applicants from among the Baptists.

2d. The annunciation of the re-immersion of brother A. Anderson by the hands of brother Thomas.

These facts predisposed my mind to receive the communication of sister Susan, without the trouble of writing to Richmond for a narrative of the whole matter. If brother Anderson be now a citizen of

Digitized by Google

the kingdom of heaven, in my judgment he certainly was when I last saw him sit with the disciples in Richmond and Fredericksburg in the fall of 1833. Immersing him upon the confession of that faith which I heard him preach two years before, did then, and does yet, look like immersing a citizen of the kingdom of heaven. But I believe (I hope not too credulously) that neither the baptizer nor the baptized has any views different from myself on the impropriety of immersing the citizens of the kingdom of heaven. Neither is there any difficulty on the question, What makes a constitutional citizen of that kingdom. The answer is, "He that believes and is immersed." On this there is no difference. But do all the Baptists believe the testimony concerning Jesus? Not more than one in a thousand opines brother Thomas. Here we differ in opinion; and this is the whole difference: for he affirms the proposition that "the notion of rebaptism into Christ is wholly out of the Record."

In a case of this kind some difficulty may arise about the proper course of procedure. We have hitherto thought, and yet think, that when an immersed person presents himself an applicant for admission into any particular congregation, having either oral or written testimony of his having been an orderly member of a Baptist community, he ought forthwith to be received—his application being evidence of his desire to submit to the institution of the Messiah as laid down in our Statute Book—the *New Testament*. If himself satisfied with his immersion, the church has no liberty, or is under no precept or obligation to demand re-immersion for its satisfaction.

The experience narratives before baptism very generally affirm faith in Jesus as the only Saviour—the true Messiah, and in his blood as the only sacrifice for sin. I do indeed affirm, that many, to my knowledge, have been immersed *into* an experience, and not *upon* an experience, destitute of the knowledge of the truth. And some there are among the disciples now, and some there were in the primitive age, that have been immersed *upon* a confession of faith, and not into the faith; for they seemed then, and seem now, "not to have the knowledge of God." To be consistent and impartial, a council should be held upon every immersed person before admission into the church, and, according to the developments of such examination, the church should act; for as our excellent brother admits, there may, perchance, be one Regular Baptist in a thousand that believed the testimony before he was immersed, and as he will admit there may be one in a thousand of those immersed for remission that did not believe the testimony at their immersion; now as he would not confound the righteous with the wicked, it will be necessary that every applicant be strictly examined—changing the apostolic injunction somewhat, to read, instead of "Examine yourselves," 'Examine one another whether you are in the faith.'

My brother Thomas has fallen upon evil times. Formerly the Baptists demanded no one to affirm that he believed his sins were forgiven through the blood of Jesus, before immersion. But now, out of opposition to the words, "Be baptized for the remission of sins,"

Digitized by Google

some, from envy, are required to declare their assurance of remission before baptism. It may, indeed, be a question whether such as were expressly immersed *because their sins were forgiven*, ought to be regarded as ignorant of the gospel and the testimony of the Apostles, and to confess their presumption and reform; but there are many thousands in these United States, personally known to myself, who have been immersed among the Baptists, and have associated under the banners of Reformation, to whom (I speak for myself) I can extend the right hand and the whole heart of fellowship as freely and as fully as to any one immersed by myself within the last ten years.

To conclude this reference to a very unacceptable subject, wishing not that we should do ourselves the injustice with the public as to represent baptism as the procuring cause of remission; and being gratified to discover that there is no difference between us, but in the opinion concerning how many of the Baptists are believers in Jesus Christ—we shall lay this matter over to a rainy day.

EDITOR.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

PORTLAND, *Ohio*, October 3, 1835.

I drop you a few lines to let you know the result of our meeting here. On Lord's day evening last, after you left us, brother H. Jones delivered a discourse from John iii.—Christ's conversation with Nicodemus. After which two came forward and made the good confession, and were immersed by him the same night. One of them was the daughter of brother Bonsall, of Morristown, and the other a daughter of sister Reed, of this neighborhood. The next day (Monday) brother Jones spoke again from Hebrews ix. and ably contrasted the two dispensations, and showed the superiority of the new over the old; and afterwards exhorted the people to obedience, when three more came forward and confessed the Lord, and I had the pleasure of introducing them into the kindom of our Lord and Master. One of them was a young lady from Wellsburg—the other two (one male and one female) live in this vicinity. So you see we had greater success at the close, than during the progress of our meeting. Six were immersed in all.

JOEL F. MARTIN.

GEORGETOWN, *Ky.* October 13, 1835.

SINCE the meeting in Versailles, our beloved brother Johnson has had a three days' meeting in Lawrenceburg. Ten or eleven persons obeyed the Lord. Last Friday was a week brother Johnson commenced a meeting in Lexington, which he continued until the Wednesday following, during which time fourteen were immersed. On that day I went up, and brother Johnson returned home. I continued the meeting, preaching every night and Lord's day until the 11th instant; during which time twelve others made the good confession, and bowed submission to Lord Messiah in being immersed in his name. Thus in ten days twenty-six individuals, principally young ladies and gentlemen, declared themselves on the side of truth and holiness. We had a better hearing during this meeting than we have ever had in Lexington. Prospects begin to brighten. The difficulties between the two parties are settled *finally*. The brethren now have a good house of worship, and are prospering. The cause is looking up, and beginning to attract notice. May it continue to prosper!

B. F. HALL.

Digitized by Google

MOUNT PLEASANT, *Pa.* October 15, 1835.

GOOD news concerning the triumph of the gospel is, I have no doubt, always acceptable to you. In a war like this, interesting both to saints and angels, the whole family in heaven and upon the earth may rejoice together at the news of victory. Although the enemy is not wholly vanquished, his ranks are thinned, and the Captains, in confusion, retire to their secret places.

The number immersed in Somerset county, including those at the protracted meeting in the spring, amounts at this time to more than one hundred. A number also have been immersed in the adjoining county, brought in principally through the instrumentality of brothers Forward and Lamphers. Since I engaged in the work, it being a month or six weeks, I have immersed twenty-three.

The cause of truth has suffered much from the misrepresentations of a number of itinerant Baptist preachers, who are engaged in travelling through Westmoreland, Fayette, Somerset, Cambria, and Indiana counties, not to preach the gospel, but to warn the people against what they call "Campbellism." The representations given are so contrary to the doctrine we plead for, that the people say of our preaching, 'If this is Campbellism, we have been misinformed.' So that these gentlemen may expect the reward of their own hands will soon be given them by an abused community. I expect to be at Jacob's creek meeting house this evening—16th, at Blairsville—17th and 18th at Ebensburg—thence to Indiana, &c. P. G. YOUNG.

MINERVA, October 21, 1835.

I WROTE to you not long since, informing you of my success in the word; and now permit me to tell you I have immersed about twenty persons more since I last wrote, seven of them near brother John Whitacre's, thirteen of whom were Presbyterians. Bless the good Lord for his word and its power manifested in the salvation of sinners!

HARRISON JONES.

From the Gospel Advocate.

CONQUESTS OF THE GOSPEL.

A TEN days' meeting at Versailles has just closed. It commenced on Saturday, the 12th of September. Jacob Creath, Sen. presided, J. T. Johnson and J. Creath, Jun. did the preaching until the Wednesday following; during which time about sixty persons confessed the Lord Jesus, and were immersed for remission. Messengers were despatched for brethren J. Challen and B. F. Hall, who arrived on Wednesday. Brethren Fleming and Lancaster joined us on Thursday evening. On Saturday, the 19th, some of the brethren left to attend a two days' meeting at Mount Vernon and the Stamping Ground. The others continued until Monday evening, the 21st. During the meeting about *one hundred and thirty-five* persons were immersed for the remission of their sins.

There was nothing of the excitement peculiar to *revivals*, so called. Nothing was preached to excite the animal feelings. It was the gospel of truth that did the work. Several Presbyterians and Methodists were immersed among the number who bowed submission to Prince Messiah.

We have no room for comment, more than that Versailles is the first place in Kentucky where the ancient gospel was received. And while our enemies are publishing far and wide that *Campbellism*, as they slanderously denominate the gospel of Christ, is dying in Kentucky, and particularly in those places where it was first embraced—we wish it to be recollected that there is in Versailles, a congregation consisting of more than 250 members, and several others in the neighborhood and county.

Brother P. S. Fall immersed two at Bethel, near Frankfort, on Lord's day, 23d of August.

F. R. Palmer and B. F. Hall, were at Providence, near Lexington, the 5th Lord's day in August—three were immersed, and one joined from the Baptists.

Digitized by Google

Brother W. Scott writes, August 21st, "That he had just returned from a three days' meeting in Brown county, Ohio—ten persons were immersed. There are said to be about fifteen hundred brethren within ten miles square, in that district.'

Brother J Coons, of Calloway county, Mo. writes, August 8—"That the good cause is prospering in his region. A church constituted about two years ago, with nine members, now numbers upwards of seventy. Brother M. P. Wills has immersed fourteen latterly."

Brother J. Mavity writes us, Harmony Landing, September 14—"That he has recently immersed eight or ten persons."

Brother J. M'Vey writes us, September 12—"That he immersed 25 a few days before, at a protracted meeting, and several since."

Brother D. S. Burnet; of Cincinnati, O. writes, September 16—"That he is just from Washington, and that twelve persons obeyed the Lord there."

Brother J. C. Anderson writes us from Murfreesborough, Tenn. September 3d—"That the day before, ten were immersed; and a few days before that, four others; and that at nearly every meeting he and brother T. C. Griffin have some make the good confession." May the Lord continue to bless the labors of these Evangelists.

[The following most acceptable intelligence is from one of my youthful playmates. He often accompanied me in my fowling expeditions when I was first entrusted with a gun. I met with him in Philadelphia, and, after an interval of twenty-six years, would not have recognized him but from his making himself known to me. This proved the happy occasion of what is recorded below; for which I most cordially thank our heavenly Father. May the good spirit of our God fill his heart with heavenly peace! and, trusting in the blood of the Lord Jesus, the great and good Shepherd of the sheep, may he always rejoice with the "joy unspeakable and full of glory!" His father was a ruling elder of the congregation over which my father presided, some thirty years ago. He has a brother, a Minister of the good old Secession Presbyterians of Ulster:]—*Ed.*

PHILADELPHIA, October 19, 1835.

Dear brother Campbell—MAY the favor of God, which has been so abundantly shed on you, be multiplied to you, your family, and all who love our Lord Jesus Christ.

I have long promised myself the pleasure of penning a few lines to you, but various causes have induced me to postpone it to the present time.

Beloved, I can look back to the evening when I first heard you preach the gospel as preached by Peter and the other Apostles of our Lord with surprise—surprise at my own stupidity—so far different was the plain simple announcement of the gospel to what I had been all my life accustomed to hear for the gospel, that I came home with the impression that much learning had had an unfavorable effect on your senses; and yet I could find nothing in all you said, which you did not clearly prove to be according to the law and the testimony. I heard you again and again with increased satisfaction, and soon became satisfied that you spoke the words of truth and soberness. I read the Harbinger with pleasure, and I believe with profit—attended the meetings of the brethren in Bank street; but, alas! I long remained only a convert of the Gate; and it was not until the last visit of brother Elley, of Lexington, Ky. in August last, that I confessed Jesus Christ, and was immersed into his name for the remission of sins. I regret much that I did not obey Jesus Christ when I first heard you announce the glad tidings. How much spiritual pleasure I have lost by not doing so! But "O, to grace how great a debtor!" How great the long suffering of God has been to spare me, and permit me again and again to hear the offer of mercy. Surely,

"If our death were his delight,
He would not thus to life invite."

Digitized by Google

May I be enabled to spend the remainder of my days in his service; and as much has been forgiven, may I love much. To you, dear brother Campbell, I am much indebted, and to our good brother Elley I am also deeply indebted. I can only say to you both, Go on in the service of our blessed Master, and he will abundantly reward you; for "they who turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars forever and ever."

It would give me great pleasure to behold your face in the flesh once more, which I hope I may be permitted to do; but to see your venerable father would fill me with joy. I dare say he does not remember me, for I was but a child when I saw him; nevertheless, his appearance and manners made an impression on my mind which has never been erased. Please present my christian love to him. Tell him I am the youngest son of his very sincere friend, the late Philip Morrison. THOMAS MORRISON.

NEW ALBANY, October 28, 1835.

THIS will inform you of our progress in this place. Three weeks after you left New Albany a division took place among us. Two resolutions were offered to the church, one of which struck at the root of the matter. We always have had some uneasy spirits among us. However, we now stand on the Word. We meet every Lord's day to break bread, &c. Two months elapsed, and not much was done. Misrepresented by the opposition. Received a few by letter from the Regulars. Continued to meet during the week. At length five came forward for baptism. In the course of five weeks nearly fifty have been immersed. Almost every night this week we have had to repair to the water. Several from the Methodist society have made the good confession. Opposition runs high. Brethren Brown, M'Call, Challan, Burnet and Short have visited us this fall. Between sixty and seventy have come in since your visit to this place, and more inquiring. You removed some difficulties. At other places near this the work goes on well. Brothers Cole and Litells are in good health. ISAAC S. ASHTON.

CINCINNATI, October 2, 1835.

THERE have been many accessions to some of the churches near here within a month or six weeks—8 or 10 here—13 at Wilmington—26 at Dayton —8 at Carthage—25 at New Albany—11 at Lawrenceburg, Ky.—140 at Versailles, &c. &c.—making 260 or 70 in that time.

D. S. BURNET.

[The following extracts are from a letter received from Ireland on the 4th instant. It is from one of the most talented and popular Ministers among the Seceding Presbyterians. He was for many years located in the city of Belfast. He and I were fellow-students and intimate companions at different intervals, from 1803 to 1807. He still is classed with that church, and now resides in the city of Newry. Enlightened and liberal men of all parties think much alike on these matters:]—*Ed.*

AS to the subjects of discussion in the Christian Baptist and in the Millennial Harbinger, there are so many topics introduced and reviewed, that I cannot, here, enter into a definite estimate of them. One thing is certain, that the scholastic cabinets have thrown too much mystery over many scripture doctrines that are plain and simple in themselves, and created technical difficulties where none before occurred. I am persuaded, also, that there are more ceremonies and appointments affixed to the usages of our great popular systems than have the divine warrant and sanction, or tend to the edification of the christian worshippers that adhere to them. The Popish and the Church of England establishments sufficiently evince this, as may also be included the Greek Church. Presbyterians have so many phases in their exhibitions and practical displays of doctrine and discipline, that it is no easy matter to separate the chaff from the wheat in their collection. The Independents are so incongruous a section of the visible church, as to render it difficult to bring

Digitized by Google

their opinions and management under critical survey. I here offer no sentiment as to the propriety or impropriety of Congregationalism as a point of discussion. What I refer to is, the almost total impossibility of pronouncing a general character of the Independent Church, including, as it does, in its ministers and members, holding so many tenets dissimilar or contrary to one another. The Methodists that in Britain, some years ago, boasted of something like unity in religious belief and sameness of ecclesiastical management, are now broken into several ramifications, warring bitterly one against another. How far any, or all of these have come short of primitive purity, or wherein their errors consist, (for systems so discrepant with one another in their elements must be fraught with errors,) I have neither space nor intention now to enlarge upon. It is surely painful to see the professing brethren of the Redeemer's family so alienated from one another in their modes of thinking and acting with respect to the most essential affairs connected with their own eternal interest and the honor of their blessed Master. Let us trust that a brighter and a better period is at hand, when the light of divine truth shall beam in every land and shine in every heart. Such an event is promised—and our duty is to hail every dawning appearance of it, and pray for its salutary and consoling radiance. I am disposed to think ere that time arrive there will be many long-hugged prejudices parted with—many falsities abandoned—and many unauthorized superfluities dismissed. There is much to pare down of the old Gothic theology ere there be erected in its room the chaste architecture of gospel simplicity. How far your labors have contributed to pave the way for this glorious and desirable era I am not prepared to say; but I can affirm, without flattery, that your writings must have a powerful effect in leading the mind to inquiry on the all-important matters pertaining to Christ's kingdom—and they must also tend, on your side of the Atlantic, to awaken strong anticipations of better things to come. Your motto is to maintain and promote the primitive gospel. You discard human tradition and human authority in divine things, and also human inventions. The inspired volume is your alone rule of faith and manners. All this is so far very good. You may have done much—nay, you may have achieved what is exceedingly valuable. Still we should exercise a jealousy over our wisest deductions—for the best of men (to use one of the old fathers) are but men at the best. I have no doubt but many of your cogitations in the Millennial Harbinger contain many pieces of sound criticism, and will prove highly advantageous to many christian readers in prompting them to look and pray for the advent of Christ's spiritual beauty and glory upon earth. For the sake of Zion I wish you success.

W. C***.

Gardner's Observations.

"*Twelve Years' Observation and Examination of Mr. Alexander Campbell's Theory and Practice of Reformation—by* Matthew Gardner, *an Elder in the Church of Christ. Cincinnati:* 1835."

THE above is the title of a *little* pamphlet, of 24 pages, duodecimo, forwarded to this office within the last moon. The author's ratio of observations is at the rate of two pages per annum. I have nothing to say *to* this attentive observer, and not much to say *of* him. I cannot say any thing *to him* as a religious man, till he clear his moral character from the charges preferred by Matthew Sellers and others, sustained by the testimony of Jesse Monroe, Alexander Hill, James Davidson, and William Dixon, *sworn to* in the presence of *Henry*

Digitized by Google

Martin, Justice of the peace, in and for the county of Brown, state of Ohio, bearing date the 5th day of September, 1835. Mr. Gardner had a trial before a *packed jury* ecclesiastic; but such a trial and acquittal will never satisfy any honest and intelligent man, after examining the testimony and oaths of the witnesses. I have the documents in my possession.

I have nothing to say *of* him that is honorable; and, therefore, will say nothing at all of his performance, save that it is, of all the catchpennies of 1835, the dearest—certainly the dearest that I have seen. This man, because of some little hymn-book concern, has been lately saying much against the reformation, else I should not have noticed this affair at all.

EDITOR.

The Baptist Banner.

THIS is the inscription on a new Baptist paper, edited at Shelbyville, Kentucky, by a Mr. *J. Waller*, under the guardian angels called assistant editors, Messrs. Dr. Noel and—somebody else, for I have not time to search up the paper.

It has assaulted us in the usual style of these preachers. In the low, vulgar, and abusive slang of the short-lived 'Baptist Recorder,' 'Chronicle,' 'Cross,' &c. it devotes a column or two to our dispraise and reprobation. If I mistake not, one of its editors, perhaps its principal, wrote a pamphlet concerning us last winter—at least I bought some such document in Frankfort, Ky. in April last. I read it but hastily and superficially, discovering in it no other merit than that of the recklessness and ignorance of its author concerning the subject on which it treats. I had not patience then, nor leisure since, to see whether it had one redeeming quality. I have no small shot for crows and black birds, and am resolved, that unless these gentlemen mend their manners, I shall grant them licence, for a very small sum per annum, to say what they please of myself and writings.

EDITOR.

Letter from Brother Henley.

"I see in the last "Herald" that I have roused our old friend, *Andrew Broaddus*, to write a sarcastic reply to my communication in the "Harbinger." You will find he has charged you with misrepresentation, if not slander, by inserting in your 'Extra Defended" the word "mere." I had not his "Extra Examined," but quoted it as you have published it. You will, I presume, reply to this part of his piece in the "Herald," and his complaining of your publishing my communication, while he disclaims fellowship with you and holds the slanderous Editor of the "Herald" in full fellowship.

Digitized by Google

If you reply, please inform him I shall sustain every item of what I said, *by his own conduct and language*, as it appears in the "Herald." His own evidence, I presume, will be valid. His resorting to a one-sided paper for defence—his appeal to the Baptist Editors of the West—his admitting his disclaiming fellowship with us for only a difference of our views of certain doctrines he held—when he well knows he had charged us, when Moderator of the Dover Association, as being demoralizers of society, must be noted. Thus he has deceived, or attempted to deceive the readers of the Baptist papers. His dissimulation will now appear, from his own acts and deeds, I think, to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced mind. His wilful misrepresentation of my being wholly given up to the practice of medicine, will be made manifest also. I shall beg a place in your November or December number to put this matter to rest, I hope, forever.

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

YOU ought, in my humble opinion, to allow our friend Broaddus to die as he lived. The above is sufficient to vindicate you from all that is alleged in "the sarcastic reply of Mr. Broaddus." I am sorry I could not republish the piece to which you refer. Had he had influence with the Editor of the "Religious Herald" to have obtained a place for your letter, then, we should have given his side as well as yours. But as it is, although they dare not do this, I am unwilling to publish your side without his. I cordially despise all one-sided representations; and in this case it would be an advantage to you that his side should appear as well as your own.

Upon the whole, then, I would advise you not to prepare the piece projected. It is wholly unnecessary for your defence—it will do him no good, and it will not change the views of one of his or your friends. Heaping coals of fire upon his head will do more for his constitution than all the cold water in the Arctic Sea.

He charges me with not doing him justice in some quotation from his "Extra Examined." This I am conscious is not the fact. I have not time to read those works over again to see if I have ever quoted as his the word "*mere*," or whether such a term is used in my "Extra Defended." It is too late for him to impugn me thus—in a paper, too, that he knows will never suffer me to defend myself. I will, therefore, only deny the charge of having ever intentionally, in any one instance, done him, in thought, word, or deed, any injustice whatever. I am sorry to witness the levity and carnality of his letter to you; and I am sorry that you should think of replying so seriously to matters which, no man who knows you, not even Mr. Broaddus himself, believes. I have no unkind feeling to my old friend for all that he has said of me or to me. I harbor no personal resentment. On this account, as well as some others, I beg you to let him alone.

EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

Reformation---No. 8.

[QUERY FROM KING AND QUEEN COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

"Ought we to attend the meetings of the parties opposed to reformation; and after the teachers have concluded their harangues to the people, rise up and attempt to undeceive them?"

Answer.—Not unless by special invitation and actual stipulation. Such a course would exasperate rather than propitiate their feelings—alienate rather that conciliate their attention. It could promise no good consequence.

Our ears are pained with numerous complaints from the most intelligent and excellent brethren, concerning the frequency of allusion to the sects, and the harshness of manner in which these allusions are made by some evangelists. They say there is much more of the pharisee and the cynic in their declamations against tenets and professors, than of the christian and the philanthropist. In reply to these brethren who make such complaints, we would say, Why not address these preachers face to face, and admonish them on the spot? There is frequently no better way than to follow the example of Nathan the Prophet, who interpreted his own parable by saying boldly and directly to the King, "*Thou art the man!*"

We are happy to learn from other quarters, that there is a continual improvement in the manner as well as the matter of the addresses of some proclaimers much complained of in former times. This is gratifying to all the lovers of the truth. No servant of Christ ought to imitate the snarling cynic, who, like the shamble fly, seems to live and fatten upon the putrid spots in human character—or on the rottenness and corruption of human systems and administrations.

Preachers who are ever and anon preaching against errors and heresies, and declaiming against abuses, may shine in the opposition like Cobbett in England, or Randolph in America. They may be feared because of their talents, but they will never be loved—admired, but not revered—listened to, but not obeyed. They may pull down, but they cannot build up—they may clear away the rubbish, but they cannot lay a stone upon the wall. They are more apt to lessen than to augment the citizens of the kingdom—and to create, than to heal divisions in society. I will not say that such proclaimers are wholly useless, or worse than useless. The tornado and the hurricane are not without their beneficial influences in the kingdom of nature. An Alexander, a Cesar, a Hannibal, a Napoleon, and even an Alaric, were, perhaps, upon the whole, benefactors in disguise on the grand scale of the whole race of men. But we now want not the thunderbolts of war, nor the fierce spirits of controversy; but argumentative, mild, conciliatory preachers—persuasive words, and a full display of the good spirit of the gospel.

Jesus Christ was not a popular preacher, nor were his Apostles; yet they gathered immense assemblies. If thousands come not to hear, thousands cannot be converted. No person should suppress the truth for the sake of usefulness, but all should speak the truth in love.

EDITOR.

[*To be continued.*]

LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

THE contributions for the year 1834–35, [one year only!] have amounted to £57,895; the payments within the year, to £45,610. The collections at the Annual Meetings in May amounted to the extraordinary sum of £1671 17*s*. including "an extra effort, special for China," at Exeter Hall, amounting to £633, of which £105 was from "the Students of Rotherham College."

Missionary Chronicle.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS OF NOS. III. & IV. OF "THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER"—LONDON.

No. III.—May, 1835.

Mr. Campbell's Preface to volume II. of his *Christian Baptist.*—Essay by Mr. Campbell on making "Confession unto Salvation."—Essay on "Religious Controversy."—Essay on the Christian Religion—THE CLERGY, No. I.—ON CATECHISMS, by an Episcopalian.—Autobiography of Mr. A. Campbell.—Obituary of Mrs. Campbell.—Essay I. on the Influence of the Holy Spirit, by PAULINUS.—Letter from W. Jones of London, to Mr. A. Campbell, of Bethany.—Acknowledgments to Correspondents and others.

No. IV.—June, 1835.

Preliminary Remarks by the Editor.— Letter from the Church in Wellsburg to a Sister Church.—Mr. Walter Scott's Circular Letter, written for the Mahoning Association.——Primitive and Modern Christianity compared.—Letter from a Correspondent to Mr. Campbell, with his Reply to it.—Extract of a Letter from another Correspondent.—ESSAY, No. II. on the Influence of the Holy Spirit, by PAULINUS.—Letter from Wm. Jones to Mr. A. Campbell, on DIVINE TEACHING.—Mrs. Campbell's Parting Address to her Five Daughters.—On Sorrow for the Dead.—On Bigotry.—Review of American Revivals, *continued.*

OBITUARIES.

DIED, on the 23d August last, triumphant in the faith he had preached, at his residence in Christian county, Ky. ISAIAH BOONE, a zealous and bold advocate of the reformation. The last scene of his life was truly instructive and impressive. Calling his family to his bedside, he said, "I give you to God who gave you to me, and to my faithful brethren in the Lord." Embracing one of the brethren present, an officer in the church, he exhorted him to be faithful to the flock over which he presided; and to all present he gave charge to prepare to meet the Lord and to give an account of themselves to God. *R. O. Warriner.*

DIED, at her reidence in Woodford county, Kentucky, Mrs. MARGARET MITCHUM, the consort of *John Mitchum*, Esq. in the 38th year of her age, leaving a husband and nine children. During her illness, of long continuance, she manifested great fortitude, patience, and wonderful resignation. Just before her departure, after singing and prayer, she embraced the writer for the last time, and observed, "I have *the most perfect confidence* in the system you teach—yea, I have the most perfect confidence." She was noted through life for benevolent deeds, hospitality to strangers, great cheerfulness and equanimity of temper, candor, friendship—for a faithful and conscientious discharge of her duties towards God and man. J. C.

Digitized by Google

Brother BURNET can make the following Work highly useful, if he will allow a Review of all the Sermons at the close of every volume. The Work may be very beneficial in reforming the speeches of Proclaimers, as well as in directing the thoughts of the brethren. I hope he will find as many readers as will afford him the opportunity of doing the good to the cause which he intends and ardently desires.

Edit. Mill. Harb.

THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER,

Consisting of Monthly Discourses by living writers—edited by D. S. BURNET.

PROSPECTUS.

The *Christian Preacher* will be a monthly, containing one or two Sermons or Essays, from living writers of the present reformation. The first Sermon is to be by Mr. Alexander Campbell. Notwithstanding this difference in structure, the work will accord with our other periodicals in general sentiment, while it cannot interfere with any of them. Its sphere will be different. During the year it will present every variety of style and topic, will favorably introduce to the public many writers who have hitherto spoken only over anonymous signatures, and will afford the reader not less than twelve nor more than twenty discourses on separate and important topics, with all the latitude any author can desire. In common papers, essays have to be restricted to two or three pages, or suffer fracture to accommodate the monthly publication. The Christian Preacher will hang on long enough to satisfy both himself and his audience if he can. The re-publishing propensity of editors will be no fault of the *Preacher*. He will borrow from none, and subscribers of other papers who attend upon his ministrations will not pay twice for the same matter, at least in the same dress. Each contributor may have a whole number to exhaust his magazine of matter, and an opportunity to say all he can say on the subject of his choice. In a work of this kind, matter and style merit, and shall receive, equal attention. At the end of the year, the numbers, accompanied with an index and title page, if bound, will make one of the neatest volumes issued from the American press. As the writers will be numerous and the subjects various, the readers cannot fail to be pleased and instructed with the combined light of a constellation of intellect.

TERMS.

1. The Christian Preacher will be printed in octavo form, on paper of superior quality, from new type, and will be neatly stitched and enclosed in a printed cover. If the work meets with encouragement, the first number will be issued January 1st, 1836, which, as far as practicable, will be followed by a number on the first Monday of each month. The price of the Christian Preacher will be One Dollar per year, of 12 numbers.

2. Any person enclosing five dollars, in advance, post paid, shall have six copies sent to any address. He shall have thirteen copies for ten dollars, or twenty-eight for twenty dollars.

3. These offers being so liberal, payment upon the receipt of the first number will be required of all persons, except the city subscribers and such responsible agents as shall become liable for five or ten copies: in such cases, within three months will be considered in advance. It will be optional with the editor to stop the paper of any one who fails to pay as above.

4. All subscriptions must commence with the first of a volume. Later subscribers can be furnished with the back numbers.

5. All communications on business must be post paid, to receive attention.

Agents for our other papers may be agents for this. Lists of subscribers should be returned as early as December 1st.

D. S. BURNET.

Cincinnati, September 24, 1835.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Number XII.—*Volume* VI.

A. CAMPBELL, EDITOR.

Bethany, Va. December, 1835.

Reply to a Reformed Clergyman---No. 8.

BY S. M. M'CORKLE, A LAYMAN.

IN our past numbers we have been showing the weakness and inconsistency of our friend's system of interpreting prophecy. We now take up the great point at issue—the literal coming of the Son of Man. This we will briefly notice, and take our leave of the public and our worthy friend, hoping the important subject may be taken up by abler hands.

The Layman's system of interpreting prophecy is simply this:—To make its concentrating point the dissolution of the present christian dispensation. The questions at issue may thus be stated:—Does prophecy point to the dissolution of nature, or does it point to the dissolution of the church? Is the dispensation to close, or is it to remain in its present form till the end of time? If the dispensation is not to close, then is the Layman's whole system of interpreting prophecy false and visionary. If the dispensation is to close, then does the old system of interpreting unfulfilled prophecy "go by the board." The one system dissolves nature contrary to the laws of nature and all former precedent—the other dissolves a corrupt dispensation, in perfect accordance with the former dealing of God toward corrupt superannuated dispensations. If the dispensation is to close, then will the doctrine of Christ's second coming follow of necessity—unavoidable necessity. Who else can dissolve the dispensation, or who else establish a new?

My old and oft repeated argument is this: If dispensations have closed, may they not close again? Can you prove away the force of this invincible proposition? Can you show one solitary text within the lids of the Bible, proving that the present dispensation is to last till the end of time. No direct proof for this fact can you advance—

Digitized by Google

no direct proof against the literal coming of Christ can you show. You rely upon indirect proof, and this inconclusive—with insuperable difficulties, ifs, and provisos.

I am aware that arguments lose force by repetition; yet I will venture to touch upon two leading features in my former essays—the dissolution of the present moral heavens, and the consequent coming of the Son of Man. I purpose showing the indirect, and then the direct proof of the Messiah's literal return. First, the indirect proof, in the predicted dissolution of the present dispensation. Now, sir, if I could place you on the proof that the present dispensation is not to close, I would well nigh gain my point. If I could rein you to an exposition of the sixth seal, your system must suffer in the effort. My dear sir, I defy you to find an object for this seal, but in the dissolution of the present Gentile dispensation. This is the *key* which unlocks the whole secret of prophecy; nor is the meaning of prophecy ever to be known until this fact be admitted. This admitted, and a system unfolds itself in perfect accordance, without absurdities or contradiction, without an unprecedented war on nature, without extinguishing, sun, moon, or stars, or depopulating infinity of space! And as I am habitually dogmatical, I defy all the clergy on earth, with all their boasted learning and research, to find another object for this sixth seal on earth—in any land, country, or nation! In my former essays I have shown the application of the sixth seal to the dissolution of nature to be absurd. With the exception of one state, our friend supposes no priests so ignorant as to thus apply the passage. Have I not shown the system of interpreting this remarkable part of God's word, adopted by the wise and learned, not only absurd, but ridiculously so. With these things before you, dispose of the sixth seal, and call to your aid the whole array of learned or unlearned priests on earth.

I have shown the doctrine of *world-burning* to be unscriptural and unphilosophical. Our friend has a pledge out on this subject: gladly would I hear him in defence of this favorite pulpit weapon. Take from the clergy their *melted rocks*, *burning worlds*, *boiling oceans*, &c. and they are almost disarmed—robbed of half their artillery for making converts. On Peter is built the favorite fooleries of the Papacy—on him is built the favorite superstitions of the Protestants; each originating in consummate ignorance of the plain meaning of scripture figures. Why is it that the clergy are always wrong—always spiritualizing the most plainly literal parts of Scripture? And when a plain figure is used, they almost universally take it in the most literal sense.

Now, brother, suppose the passage in Peter, on which the whole system of *world-burning* is built, be turned into a figure representing some certain fact, what is the consequence? It is this: the literal *heaven* and *earth*, used as figures, representing some other *heaven* and *earth*, plainly called for in the moral kingdom, is at once released from the predicted catastrophe. But a *heaven* and *earth* represented in the figure, is involved—must suffer and undergo that which was

Digitized by Google

proposed to be the fate of the figure. If this passage in Peter be turned into a figure, it will prove fatal to your whole theory—it will involve the moral kingdom in the proposed ruin. The *heaven* and *earth* involved in the ruin cannot be rebuilt but by the hand that dissolves. In my former essays I have shown to demonstration that God's moral government on earth is called *heaven*. I have shown that men of the world, in contradistinguishment from this moral government, are called *earth*. Have I not shown, that, in the *moral kingdom*, we have every thing called for, which we find in the kingdom of nature? A perfect correspondence—a harmony in the two kingdoms. This must be admitted, or you may throw away your Bible as a bundle of inconsistencies.

Now, how can we understand that which is spoken, without examining the proposition? If the proposition be contrary to the known laws of nature—contrary to all former precedent—why not, with all propriety, go into the kingdom of grace for an object? If in this kingdom of grace we find things called by the same name of those found in the kingdom of nature—if we find former precedent in this moral kingdom, for our application of prophecy, without violating any of its known laws—in the name of common consistency, why not look for and expect, in this kingdom, the accomplishment of the prediction? In holy writ we have the two kingdoms plainly placed before us: in them we find the fulfillment of all prophecy. Now, suppose we go in for past precedent: do we know of any literal *heaven* and *earth* which have been destroyed? No. Do we know of any thing in the word "kingdom" which has been called *heaven* and *earth*, that has been destroyed? Yes; Peter in prophesying of a *heaven* and *earth* which are to be destroyed by fire, alludes to something of a like kind, which had been destroyed by water; also, refers to a promise, by the which we are to look for "*new heavens and earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.*" Do these all agree in kind? Yes, or there is inconsistency in the writer.

Now suppose we examine the promise referred to by the Apostle; and before we consult the Prophet, fairly admit the Apostle alludes to the dissolution of our own globe by fire, and the natural heavens above us: suppose them all destroyed—*earth dissolved—sun, moon, and stars extinguished!!* This is the theory of the day. Suppose we turn to the promise on record. (See Isaiah, 65th and 66th chapters.) Here we find the old Prophet directly or indirectly calling for the sun, the moon, the earth, men, women, and children, sabbaths, houses, and vineyards—more—"And they shall go forth and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me." Astonishment!! Who will reconcile the disagreement between the Prophet and the Apostle—or, rather, between our teachers and the Prophets—if, indeed, they understand either Prophet or Apostle! Their blunders would have been pardonable if the moral kingdom had not been called *heaven*. Such the consequence of *scrap expositions*—of not making the Prophets explain the Prophets!

Digitized by Google

Now, brother, Isaiah must rule Peter's meaning, for he refers to him; but our Priests will rule both Prophet and Apostle into absurdities enough to shock all common sense, rather than not have the world annihilated by fire!—Now, sir, the main pillars of your building are plucked away. You must deny the allusions of Peter to any recorded promise, or yield the contest. The *heaven and earth* to be destsoyed must be found in the moral kingdom—none other can be alluded to—none other found on which Prophet and Apostle can agree, but the present moral administration—the transferred kingdom of *heaven*, taken from the Jews according to the saying of the Master, and given to the Gentiles. This is as plain as demonstration. By whom was the present moral kingdom created? By whom is the same to be dissolved? By whom is the *new heaven and earth* to be created? Does it require inspiration to answer these questions, or to determine what personage is to superintend these prodigious events?

As before observed, figures always have a literal meaning: will our brother tell us how many worlds, in scripture idiom, have been destroyed? Will he say the world yet to be destroyed by fire, is to be different in kind from those which have been destroyed? Our brother will most assuredly acknowledge that dispensations have been called "worlds," and that the term "world" is often used relative to man. For instance, "The *world* is gone after him"—"Sin of the world," &c.—"Upon whom the ends of the world are come" *Com. Version.* "On whom the ends of the ages are come." *Campbell.* "Upon whom the ends of the ages are come." *Wakefield.* "The harvest is the end of the world." *Common Version.* "The harvest is the conclusion of this state." *Campbell.* "The harvest is the conclusion of this age." *Wakefield.* Common sense will find but little difficulty in all cases to determine the proper application of the term *world*—to matter, man, or the dispensation in which he lives.

Holy writ abounds with unintelligible propositions without the terms "world," "ages," "heaven," "earth," &c. be not often taken in a moral sense. This admitted, the changes which have taken place, and which are yet to take place, are intelligible.

The first age of the world had its rule of obedience—its mode of worship—made its saints and prophets—and was dissolved. The second *age* had its worship, its system of obedience, made its saints and prophets, became corrupt, and was dissolved. The third *age*, (the christian age,) has its worship, its rules of obedience—is in the aggregate ruined by its administrators—has existed about the age of its predecessors—is to close—its close is predicted—and a new moral system of obedience is to succeed—"a new heaven and a new earth." Religion, test of obedience, modes of worship, have been changed—may be changed again, when the Sovereign of the moral kingdom may see proper, without violating moral principles. But the effects of obedience on man to the established system of moral government has never changed—will never. Piety is the same in all ages, under all dispensations.

Digitized by Google

Brother, are you yet sceptical relative to the close of the present dispensation? If I have proved this fact no more argument is necessary to establish the literal coming of the Son of Man. But I have promised some direct proof.

No precedent have we in holy writ for turning Christ's coming in the clouds of heaven into a figure. Nothing of the like kind has ever happened. Nothing in the past will justify the transfer from a literal to a figurative meaning. No man on earth can give one definite idea of what a spiritual coming in the clouds of heaven means. A figurative coming is, perhaps, less definable. If a constructive construction had been intended by any divine penman on the words "coming in the clouds of heaven," we would have had some precedent for turning the plain simple meaning into a something else. For the life of me I can gather no definite ideas on the subject. Make it a spiritual presence in the church--is he not spiritually present? What kind of church would we have without Christ's spiritual presence? Make it a mighty outpouring, a great revival—then it can only be an increased coming—an increase of that which had come eighteen hundred years ago. Say it is to be the setting up of the Christian King "on all the thrones of all the kingdoms of the world." Where will you find them? Would a good man accept a crown? Your "new dynasty of kings" must be endued with apostolic piety and inspiration, or it will soon be a reign of terror! Put the present religionists on all the thrones of all the kingdoms, and it may emphatically be called a literal coming of *the son of perdition!!*

Our friend relies much on the Lord riding into Egypt "on a swift cloud." (See Isaiah xix.) Taking the passage altogether, it cannot be shown in the past. If in the future, it will prove nothing—it may be literally fulfilled. Or is it to give character to all the passages in holy writ where "the clouds of heaven" are mentioned. In all comings there are three things expressed or implied—*time*, *manner*, and *design*. In Daniel is found the oldest prediction on the subject. He must rule the meaning of all following prophecy wherein "the clouds of heaven" are called for, until an actual coming in the cloud takes place. According to the Prophet, the Son of Man is in design coming to receive "dominion and glory, and a kingdom that all people, nations, and languages should serve him." Say this is to be at the end of time. Then at the end of time he is to receive dominion over "nations and languages." Are there to be "nations and languages" in another state of being? But Paul says, "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father." How will you reconcile these contradictions?

Farther, Luke the historian says, "While they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight." With this prediction left, "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven"—on a cloud. What for? To deliver the kingdom into the hands of God the Father, or to receive dominion over the kingdoms of the world? The manner in which he is coming to receive do-

Digitized by Google

minion over the nations is specified; but the manner in which he is to deliver the kingdom into the hands of God the Father, is no where proposed.

You will admit that there is one great coming in the future. If so, how will you spiritualize a coming foretold by Paul, 2d Thessalonians. "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire." Will you make a figurative coming out of this? Is this spiritual presence to be in his people, and they the recipients of this flaming fire? You must make two comings or more, or your system must suffer; for the Apostle goes on with an unbroken chain of reasoning, beseeching the brethren by the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, &c. "Let no man deceive you," (says he,) "by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed," &c. "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." Three times, in quick succession, has the Apostle alluded to the coming of Christ, which must relate to the same object, the same event, or there is a most palpable impropriety in the author. If the coming to destroy the son of perdition be a thousand years previous to the Lord being "revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire," of all ambiguous, careless writers, Paul deserves the palm. How is the gathering together unto *him* to take place if the coming be figurative? Can you gather or collect to an object indefinite, without locality, on which the senses cannot act? Will you lift a new standard, a new "*Lo, here!*" and call it the spiritual advent of Christ? Here the Shakers have a prior claim! Without demonstration, the most stupendous miracles to attend the "new order," it will be considered a "first born of Satan." I suppose our brother to be well versed in the rudiments of the English language: can he make the personal pronoun *him* out of a thing with neither "body, parts, nor passions"? Just such a thing must a figurative gathering together unto *him* be. It cannot be defined or identified in any given spot on the face of the globe. You will say, this collecting is to be at the close of time: then, at the close of time, will the destruction of the son of perdition be!!

I will now collect some plain scripture proof of the literal coming of the Son of Man:—"I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of Man come with the clouds of heaven." *Daniel.* "And they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory." *Matthew.* "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels." "When he shall come to be glorified in his saints." "And to them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation." "Without sin-offering." *Campbell.* "Without any sin-offering." *Wakefield.* "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, you do show the Lord's death till he come." "Therefore, judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come." "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen

Digitized by Google

him go into heaven." "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restitution of all things." "Watch, therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." "Therefore, be ye also ready; for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh." "But as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." "Even thus shall it be when the Son of Man is revealed." "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ." "Behold, I come as a thief." "Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him."

One uniform meaning, one uniform allusion to some great event in the future, in all the above quotations. Is this a literal coming, or does it mean a something else, neither expressed, implied, nor understood? Without former precedent or date to go by—without one definite idea attached to the all-important proposition, *the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven.* At once is the proposition in its simple import, understood by all common sense; but who is to give the true spiritual signification? None; no, not one! A tangible proposition cannot be made on the subject. Conjecture is let loose without law, lines, or landmarks to define this spiritual coming, its manner, design, or time—varying with every imagination, dubious, undefinable, and baseless.

A coming must forever be considered personal, without some phrase or consideration be coupled with it, controlling its meaning. With none of the above quoted passages, nor with any now recollected in the Book, where a coming is alluded to, is there coupled any considerations, expressed or implied, which will justify the idea that the coming is not to be as literal as the first advent.

A figurative coming is unknown among the Apostles—would have been yet unknown, if common sense had been left to understand language in its common acceptation—would have been yet unknown but for our doubting Doctors, our sceptical Priests. A non-entity, a deity without "body, parts, or passions," is just as definable as this spiritual coming. With spiritualizers originated the doctrine of this figurative coming, long after the uncorrupt age of christianity had gone by—after the smoke from the bottomless pit had enveloped the gospel heaven.

I make no charges against our worthy brother for these things; no doubt but he is honestly following the tradition of the elders, who have been fabricating smoke, and vending darkness! The volumes of smoke, the piles of dull divinity which have risen in rayless columns in the christian atmosphere, form a conspicuous part of the moral darkness, the smoke of the bottomless pit! The luminaries of the moral world are eclipsed, the light of the gospel heaven obscured, an "incubus of a thousand years" is hanging heavy as the sleep of death on the senses of men, nor will the spell be broken for a thousand years to come, short of the emphatical cry, "*Behold he cometh!*"

Intimately connected with the coming of the Lord, his great second coming, is the words "come as a thief." We will see how this agrees with your spiritual advent. Can you make Christ's spiritual presence

Digitized by Google

come as a thief? A great revival come as a thief? The spirit of the martyrs come as a thief? Are the fruits of christianity, faith, hope, charity, to come as a thief? Make men universally pious, and you have your spiritual coming consummated. This, according to your own theory, your own showing, is to be gradual. Tell me, what kind of gradual coming would a thief make? You will say, sudden destruction is to come as a thief. Inspiration says, "Behold I come as a thief." Will you make the personal pronoun "I" out of the word "destruction"? Spiritualizers have a strange way of confounding agents and events. Christ, speaking of his coming, gives the clue—that it would be like the coming of a thief—unexpected. But, alluding to the same event, says, "The day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night;" "for when they shall say, Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them." The sense of scripture is much broken by being broken into chapters; and it is a folly to lay a particular stress upon *this* day of the Lord, separate from the coming of the Lord. A personal coming is first proposed; then the *time* or the *day* is to be like the thief, unexpected. The Apostle, manifestly alluding to the same event, says, "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels," &c. Peter says, "In the last days scoffers shall come, saying, Where is the promise of his coming?" "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief."

The religionists, the sects, are looking for a great spiritual coming, and making great exertions to bring it about. This cannot come as a thief, while they are the prime agents in bringing about the coming. A man-made advent! On this subject we will notice Rev. xvi. 15. "Behold I come as a thief." One uniform meaning to this expression must be admitted. The Apostle in narrating the great battle of Armageddon, has made the greatest digression from this subject ever known or recorded, if the expression "come as a thief" be not intimately connected with his subject. Three unclean spirits are represented as agents gathering the kings of the earth "to the battle of the great day of God Almighty. Behold I come as a thief," &c. "And he gathered them together (the kings) into a place called in the Hebrew tongue, Armageddon." Was there ever such a digression? The battle cannot come as a thief; it is a concerted plan; the kings are consulted; have collected their armies—not as a thief. The destruction cannot come as a thief; it is the unavoidable attendant on all battles. Now, brother, what is to come as a thief! No doubt but the great battle is to be the harbinger of the great personage who is to come as a thief, at or about this time. A personage, and nothing ele, can be made out of the emphatical words, "Behold I come as a thief."

Relative to the "paralyzing effect" of these opinions: Are they calculated to lull men into slumbers, or make them relax their exertions to avoid the impending vengeance? Who will not keep his garments white, when expecting to be called into the presence of his Master? Who will not keep clean hands, when expecting the scrutiny of the *King of kings?* Who will be found scrambling for *filthy*

Digitized by Google

lucre, when expecting a deluge of fire? Who will not relax his invincible hold on creeds, names, and parties, when believing they soon will be doomed to perdition? Or who, believing in the speedy and personal return of the Lord, will cry out, as some are doing, "unprofitable controversy"? Tantamount to this, is the saying, "Where is the promise of his coming." Can a more important question be proposed than the personal advent of the Messiah? Can a more interesting scene be presented to the mind of man, than a host of immortalized beings, in the garniture of the gods, visiting our world? A procession of saints and angels escorting the King to the place where he by wicked hands was nailed to the cross! Is it an unprofitable controversy that sheds light on the page of prophecy? Is the present dispensation to close—is it to terminate in tremendous judgments—is there a new era to commence, the most important since the creation—is it to usher in with the terrors of Omnipotence, and the investigation unprofitable? When these things can fairly be proved chimerical, let our dreaming watchmen chant their lullabies, and the chorus of their dosing hearers be, "Peace and safety!"

—

Once for all: The editor of the Millennial Harbinger, foreseeing an interminable controversy rising between a Reformed Clergyman and a certain dogmatical Layman, proposed that the latter should take some certain strong point of debate. Did he not allow an alternative—the weak points of the Clergyman's system? This was chosen—and with our friend, is beyond endurance—"superlative dogmatism." Plain truth makes men confident confidence with our brother is "dogmatism."

Our friend has lately made out certain *five points*, on which issue should have been made! Why did he not stick to these *points* himself? Beside the *five points*, he has descanted on the following fifteen, or more *points*, none of which comes within the line of his *five points;* on which the Layman is not allowed to animadvert:—"Judgments, not the types of judgments—Church coming out of Babylon, or wilderness—Dispensations reformed—Length of dispensations—Analogies, romantic things—Power of the Press—Clergy, the best class in any community—Figurative meaning of Scripture—Resurrection of the dry bones—Gog and Magog—Novelty of opinion, being letter patent for reception—New dynasty of Kings—Judgments and gospel evangelizing the world—*Binding the Dragon*—Two-horned beast—Exposition of the seven vials—Distribution of Babylonish or antichristian riches among friends of the *new order*—Parties to be engaged in the great battle—A long dissertation on *the son of perdition*: to wit, *the Mother of Harlots!!*—The means of his: to wit, *her* destruction," proving to be the brightness of Christ's *coming*!

Farther, the Apocalypse is not named in the two first replies, those alluded to; yet they are called a "new soldering of his (the Layman's) twelve months' conception on the Apocalypse." I have been ambling along, right on his *trail*, and it is called "a second edition of *his* speculation on the clergy," &c. Have I not quoted him *verbatim*—followed him in close step? This is an outrage—all "long shot," "brandishing the sword," &c. and I am urged to stick "numerically" to some "radical *point!!*" A *point* which our friend has labored with his best success, (and with as little conviction to the Layman as any other) he has labored over a second time. It happens to fall as far without the line of his "radical *points*" as any digression the Layman has made.

Suppose we admit our friend correct in the length of dispensations—that the Jewish began with Moses instead of Abraham—what is gained? According to his own showing, two have closed. Does this exempt a third from a

Digitized by Google

like fate, when alike corrupted and abused? Here we arrive again at the old reiterated *point* of the Layman's argument—*the dissolution of the present Gentile dispensation—the centering point of prophecy*, if the assertion be not too dogmatical for our brother. This admitted, and the Apocalypse *is intelligible—the gorgon knot unties!* What is the Apocalypse?—a *gossip tale*, a Sinbad story, a Joe Smith fabrication, that a reference to it is taken in such high *dudgeon?* Does our friend scorn the Book, or only the efforts common sense is making to understand the mysterious register of terrible events? If common sense is to be intimidated from inquiry by the sneers of the learned, the meaning is to be unknown—is to be unfolded in vengeance—deciphered in ruin. This, as usual, is a "superlative dogmatism."

Our friend winces at the liberties taken with the clergy and commentators. Says they do not deserve the reprobation of heaven and earth, with these facts in array against them: *More than a hundred different Lo! heres—roads to heaven—bonds of union—pride, strife, and presumption, their characteristics!* Say the reformation is right, and where have the Priests led all christendom? What are they? What have they been? Throughout christendom they are performing proxy worship toward heaven, *for pay!* In past ages they mediated between man and the gods, no matter how horrid the sacrifice or hellish the worship! With their *keys of the kingdom of heaven they open the gates of perdition.* Where they have had a deal in power, they have always dealt in blood. They have managed every infernal sacrifice on earth. Where they have not made worship altogether horrid, lewd, or ridiculous, they have introduced into it some uncalled for rites, ceremonies, or appendages. By their hands all dispensations have been ruined. They hang on the present like an *incubus.* But, alas for man! in throwing off clerical tyranny, they run to a sad extreme—revolt from the government of heaven—turn sceptics. In the present age this is lamentably true.

E. Smith and Winchester are occasionally called up—are not "Daniels." It so happens I have read neither. If our friend has read Begg on the restoration and conversion of the Jews, without faith, he would not believe though one should "rise from the dead."

Your "alternate replication" for the present I decline, without our friend should come out with a new theory on the sixth seal, or should attempt to prove the comments of the learned on the same, not emphatically a libel on the God of truth. Adieu. S. M. M'CORKLE.

P. S. The theory of reformation has gone its length; the practical part must follow, or it will soon go the way of all living. It is the last vigorous pulsation—the last glow of returning life to the dying body. Alas! when this stimulus is over, the vials will follow. Each returning glow makes but a shorter stay. The *reformation*—what is it? What is it to be? What a tremendous responsibility is hanging on poor erring man! Few are dreaming of the part it is to form in the great drama, before the coming of "the great and dreadful day of the Lord"—the harbinger of more than man has seen, and no doubt will form, in some way, a part of the *voice*—the emphatical *cry*, "Come out of her, my people!" S. M. M.

Thus endeth the prophecy upon the prophecies of our bold and adventurous Layman of Indiana. We have patiently, and with much interest, listened to the last lingering note of his eighth trumpet against the Reformed Clergyman and in support of his views of the future. Determined that our readers shall have a fair opportunity of deciding for themselves, we have, perhaps, for some of them, allotted too many pages to this discussion; but if we err, we err from adherence to the fundamental principle which has marked

Digitized by Google

our course from the first page till now. We shall hear the Reformed Clergyman for as many pages, if he can profitably occupy so many: at which time it is presumed that our readers will have fully heard both sides, and be fully satisfied on the whole ground claimed by these disputants. I return my thanks to brother M. for his communications. *Editor.*

Slavery and Anti-Slavery.

NUMEROUS and various communications on the subject of SLAVERY are received at this office. They are all laid upon our table until the present storm be passed by. A person might as rationally expect a candid hearing in a Methodist Chapel in defence of Calvinism, or an impartial audience in a Calvinian Tabernacle in defence of Arminianism, as in this moment of feverish excitement, borderin on insanity, to expect in the South or in the North a fair and impartial, and liberal and magnanimous consideration of any question arising out of the rival interests of free and slave labor. This question, which, more than any political question, demands the coolest, the gravest, and the most profound regard and examination—this question, on the solution of which the temporal destiny of this nation and the eternal destiny of millions of human beings hang in awful uncertainty, so powerfully grasps all the great mainsprings of human action, that it deigns not to be approached by any avenue favorable to a just, and generous, and humane decision. All that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, have formed a solemn league and covenant, and sworn by their unholy trinity that it shall only be discussed by the light of burning palaces, cities, and temples, amidst the roar of cannon, the clangor of trumpets, the shrieks of dying myriads, and all the horrid din and crash of a broken confederacy, falling states, a servile war, and the agonizing throes of the last and best republics on earth!

It is, in our judgment, a question that ought not to be discussed in any point of view in which it stands at this crisis before the American people. Regarding as we do the rights political, the rights vested and guarantied in, and to, the South—and the theory, and the logic, and the rhetoric, and the morality, and the religion of the North, in reference to this complex controversy, we can think of no expedient to allay all feeling, to meet all difficulties, to render to all their dues, more rational, political, and just, than that suggested in No. II. Vol. III. of this work.

We have all the means and all the facilities to settle this matter forever. if we choose. We can do justice to the South and to the North, and we can do justice to the master and the slave, as well as shew mercy: but justice first—mercy afterwards. We may have, we can have *ten millions* surplus revenue for fifteen or twenty years

Digitized by Google

to come, and all the wheels of government move on as smoothly as they now do—yea, more smoothly. *Public and private interests will all flourish more by appropriating ten millions per annum in exporting and colonizing the* YOUNG *Negroes, somewhere in Africa, or on the American continent, than by cutting down the revenue to the mean of our national expenditures.*

Could I wish for political influence, or political talent, or for the standing of any man in this nation, it would be for one purpose, and but for one—viz. to call to the South and to the North to unite for their own temporal salvation, and that of their children, in one grand national scheme of doing justice and shewing mercy to master and slave. Had I the forensic eloquence of a Demosthenes, and the political popularity of a Washington, they should be consecrated to the salvation of this nation from the greatest evils, which, every day accumulating, will sooner or later (and sooner perhaps than any one imagines) burst on the heads of our beloved offspring, with a vengeance and a fury exasperated in the ratio of their delay, and as irresistible as death.

This cause I would plead in the following manner:—I would hold as sacred the rights of the South to their slaves as I do the rights of the North to their land, neither of which were at first obtained in the temple of Justice and by the laws of immutable right and obligation; but both of which are now consecrated and sanctioned by national agreements, bonds, and pledges, as solemn as matrimony, and as irrevocable as the Magna Charta of our national existence.

I would, therefore, no more think of wresting the slave from his master than I would the land from its owner, without a full and satisfactory consideration. I would discountenance by all the sanctions and solemnities of religion, morality, and political statute, every interference, whether in the form of Abolition, or any other Society, aiming at impairing the right, authority, or interest of the master in or over his slave, or tending to the creation of any dissatisfaction in the bosom of the slave that would in the least alienate him from the interests of his master. I would not allow of any measure that would jeopardize the life, property, or domestic comfort of any master in the twenty-four American states. But I would make it a national affair, to a certain extent, in despite of the sqeamishness of local views and feelings, arising from state or federal doctrines or modes of interpretation applied to our constitution, by showing that this was a question *sui generis*—like no other—above all others—involving in it national existence; not policy, nor prosperity, nor sectional interests, but *absolute existence;* not well being only, but being itself. As David eat the loaves of the presence, contrary to a divine statute itself, and was justified because life was depending; so would I have the nation to act upon this matter for the same reason, and without any constitutional scrupulosity proceed in the most expeditious manner to carry out the will and wishes of the majority of the nation.

There is one thing the majority can constitutionally do, and that is enough for our purpose. *They can dispose of the surplus revenue to*

Digitized by Google

save the life of the nation. This is all the nation has to do, only let it be done judiciously according to vested rights, and our national existence is secured—aye, and our prosperity, too, increased in a ratio hitherto wholly unprecedented. And here let me ask, What will be the surplus revenue for twenty years to come, under the operation of existing laws, in accordance with the growing population and prosperity of the Republic? I answer in the round terms of ten millions per annum or two hundred millions of dollars. And sure I am that the nation can make it more than ten millions per annum without any state or family in the union feeling itself one cent per annum poorer in pursuance of the system.

Let, then, a territory on this continent, or on the African, be obtained or purchased, to which all the *young Negroes* especially, which can be purchased annually from those who will not manumit, be deported, and to which those that are now, or shall hereafter be made free, shall be *invited* to withdraw in the prospect of a comfortable settlement.

Let our navy, now rotting in our harbors and in foreign waters, be occasionally and partially, at least, employed in aid of the transportation of such slaves as shall have been purchased for manumission; and in addition to these, let a number of ships be built or purchased, and prepared for the business; so as annually, at least, to carry off of those ages most conducive to propagation, to the full amount of our surplus revenue.

Or if, in the wisdom of the nation, some part of this continent shall be selected, perhaps with less expense, and more immediately could the land be freed from impending evils. It is not my province, however, to go into details, or to expatiate on ways and means: the nation is able, and a majority willing to adopt decisive measures, that, in a quarter of a century, at farthest, would break up, root and branches, American slavery. For if only a half or two-thirds of the present stock was carried out of the land, and the balance left to scatter through the whole country, according to the course of nature and of human affairs, it would be in all the states as it is now in the Canadas, or in some of those states that once had slaves.

We need not wait till the minority are all willing to adopt these measures, or any others, on this subject: for that time has never yet arrived in any human concern of much interest. But we must call forth the majority. The only question is, How can this be done in all good feeling and in all respect for vested rights? To which question I answer, Let petitions to Congress be got up all over the land, setting forth the present and the future prospects of the whole union on this subject—expatiating on the practicability of gradually reducing and finally extirpating the evil—then praying, in all the fervors of political piety, for the appropriation of all the surplus revenue, for years to come, as a fund for *purchasing* from those who will sell and will not manumit their slaves, and for colonizing them on their own soil. Let these petitions be multiplied and circulated in all states and territories, amongst those friendly to the subject, from

Digitized by Google

year to year, until, as in the British Parliament, the Capitol be filled with the prayers of the nation; and they will be heard and answered as certain as death.

But by all that is desirable in our national union, harmony, peace, and prosperity, let all debates, pamphlets, and speeches on the abstract questions now debated be suppressed; and in the spirit of our federal constitution let us go to work to do justice to the South, North, East, and West, to master and to slave, and all will yet be well. We can do it—only begin right, and persevere. It is not my business to do more than I have done in courtesy to numerous solicitations on the subject—merely to make these suggestions. There are wiser heads and abler hands, to whom we would most earnestly and respectfully tender these hints, hoping that the ten thousand blessings in store for him or them who will save this land from ruin, will induce some Calhoun, Clay, or Webster, or some other mighty spirit, to turn his or their attention to this greatest and best of political undertakings.

EDITOR.

Letters to Bishop James H. Otey, of Tennessee.

Letter VII.

My dear Sir,

WHETHER directly or indirectly, I have at length arrived at a point in my series of reflections on modern episcopacy, the most vital, in your ecclesiastic polity, to all the claims of apostolic pre-eminence, preferred at this day by your most recent writers, as well as by that learned host of prelates, which, for more than two centuries past, have been contending for diocesan episcopacy as essential to the character of the true and worthy church of Christ. True, indeed, I have listened with more than ordinary astonishment at the short-sightedness and untowardness of sectarianism to the learned and ingenious arguments of this distinguished class of pleaders, who, intent on making good their claim to be the only apostolic church, are all the while defending the exclusive divine authority of the Roman priesthood of the fifteenth century, to dispense all christian ordinances—in fact to be the "true and proper official successors" of the holy Apostles; and the very "Mother of Harlots" herself to be the legitimate spouse of Jesus Christ; for the sake of legitimating their birthright to the standing and reputation of the only true and apostolic church, and the exclusive warrant for the valid administrations of the christian institution.

If the Roman hierarchy in the fifteenth century was the legitimate spouse of Jesus Christ, I think it must be agreed she is so at this hour; for, certainly, in point of character, she is no worse now than then. Thus while most of your prelates glory in your institution as the pure and apostolic church of Christ, they seem to me, indeed, all the while as making Jesus Christ a polygamist—as having two

Digitized by Google

churches holy and apostolic—each his true and proper spouse, living under his protection, at one and the same time. For my life I cannot see any way of avoiding this conclusion in your way of managing the controversy.

Your writers, as far as I now remember, to a man, in defending your ordination, legalize all the papistic ordinations for one thousand years; for the same reason that had the birthright of George IV. been questioned, it might have been necessary for him to have proved not only his legitimate descent from the 1st, 2d, and 3d George, but also the exclusive right of George III. and his Queen to the British throne. But there is this unfortunate dissimilarity in the two cases, that while George IV. claimed not the throne while his parents lived, your church claims the exclusive right to be the true apostolic church while yet her mother lives; and is still sustaining all the pretensions of her mother, to be Christ's true and proper church.

To avoid this difficulty there is but one way patent: all the other sects have discovered it. They, like Solomon's pretended mother and unjust claimant of the living child, say, Let the right belong to all: be it "neither yours nor mine." Hence "the charity" of all the sects for one another. This "charity," and that all-saving clause in the constitution of every sect—viz. "that official grace cannot be corrupted" by any defect of person or character, justify and sustain all the pretensions of all parties to a valid administration of all christian ordinances. Why not, then, all form one communion! If Jesus Christ be with them all, and the Holy Spirit dwell in them all, and God the Father acknowledge and receive them all, why, in the name of reason, justice, and consistency, do they not all acknowledge one another and unite in one grand communion, and forever demolish the hundred and ten partizan walls which alienate them and often cause them to worry and devour each other!

But to the point—the vital point—the rallying point in the whole controversy: With whom did Jesus Christ leave the right to make a bishop? *With bishops*, or *with the whole community?* Romanists, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians all agree that the right is in one caste or class—a sacred order, in long succession from the Bishop of Rome. True, indeed, you may differ, and do differ among yourselves, about *orders within that order;* but you all contend for an elect order of clergy, having, Phenix-like, a peculiar immortality—a reproducing power within itself. The blood of Levi ran not more directly and exclusively in the veins of his fleshly descendants, than does the official grace run in the order or orders of clergy, whether papistical, prelatical, or presbyterial. With you all it is *hereditary*—it is by descent according to an order. You may have different orders, as that of Aaron, or that of Melchisedec; but you all go for an order of sacred persons, with procreative powers. And to Rome, the great city of establishments, you all look for authority. Your calendar of ecclesiastic times and of saints, is only kept for the meridian of 'the eternal city.'

Now we affirm that the New Testament recognizes no such an order of things. Lineage belonged to the Old Testament times and

Digitized by Google

things, to the intent that the promises concerning THE SEED should be manifestly fulfilled. The house of David and the house of Aaron were the only two houses to which lineage belonged as a thing of indispensable importance in the remedial system, while in prospective viewed and displayed.

Lineage and ordination to office, however, are two things distinct as any other two things in the ten commandments. *The blood in the head and the blood in the hands imposed on that head, were never the same blood by an ordinance of God.* With ancient and modern Judaizers the blood in the hands imposed, and on the head ordained, must be the same blood. This is a capital distinction, and runs more deeply into the argument than any prelate of the days of Elizabeth ever thought of. If it be a truth that Levites were not permitted to ordain Levites to office, what comes of all the arguments found in a hundred quartos drawn from the Jewish Scriptures in support of clergymen, whether presbyters or bishops, as exclusively imposing hands in the act of ordaining.

The Pentateuch affords no countenance to such an idea. When ordination to office, or consecration to special services was first introduced, God commanded the party *for whom* the office or service was instituted to lay their hands on the party receiving office; and not the party to ordain themselves. Imposition of hands is but the sign of a covenant between two parties, which covenant was instituted by the head of the church, and for the prosperity of the church; and, therefore, the party conferring the office is the only party to which the sign of conferring the office belongs—the only party that can rationally and consistently impose hands on the recipients of office. Hence *lay ordination* is the first ordination mentioned in the ecclesiastic annals of the world.

I need not, my dear sir, after your perusal of my late Extra on Order, say to you, that we commenced our examinations of this subject with the ordination of the Levites by the hands of the whole congregation of Israel, as found in the 8th chapter of the book of Numbers: an occurrence of so much importance in this controversy, tha I know not how to account for the general inattention to it in the voluminous debates on ordination. The best, indeed the only solution of this singular oversight which I can imagine, is found in the fact, that the contending parties are all so much on one side of the question, and this historical fact so contrary to all their theories, that none of them knows how to dispose of it; and, therefore, seeing as much in it against themselves as against their opponents, they prudentially resolve to pass it in silence.

But, sir, we are instituting an investigation of the *meaning* of ordination that we may the better understand the *sign*. The forms of matrimony, (which, by the way, in some countries none but those in holy orders can solemnize) are not intelligible without the meaning of the institution. This understood, and no person would think of giving his hand to the bride in the solemnization of this institution, but the bridegroom himself.

Digitized by Google

We ask, then, in all categorical formality, *What is the meaning of ordination?* "It is," say Catholics and Protestants, "the setting of a person apart to some holy ecclesiastic office." This is the thing; and the forms are prayer and the imposition of hands accompanied with fasting. But is there not an agreement between the parties, a covenant made between the church and the candidates for consecration antecedent to ordination itself? To this all parties assent. The church stipulates in her call, election, or choice; and the bishop or deacon elect re-stipulates and agrees. The signing and the sealing of any bond by the parties is subsequent to a clear apprehension of all its provisions and details. And as no person but the parties, or those whom they appoint to act for them, can sign and seal the covenant; so in this solemn contract between these ecclesiastic parties, none can impose hands but the party ordaining, or some persons appointed by it—as for example, the already existing eldership or senate of the congregation.

But there is some ill-defined notion in the minds of learned and unlearned that imposition of hands, because formerly sometimes the sign of the communication of some extraordinary gift, actually imparts some peculiar grace, or authority from heaven, which gives to the ministrations of such persons an efficacy not present with the services of those not so ordained. Hence there are some who regard ordination as rather designed to impart authority from God than from man, to officiate for man in things pertaining to his edification and salvation. Such reasoners seem not to have noticed that persons acting under the immediate authority of God never had human hands laid upon them. Melchisedec, Moses, Aaron, David, and all the Prophets of the Jewish age, together with John the harbinger, and the twelve Apostles, with all the Prophets of the Christian Institution received no ordination from human hands. A fact this that goes to show that imposition of hands was not instituted for conferring divine grace or authority on the persons so ordained, but simply the authority of the community in whose behalf hands were imposed on them. And as the Head of the christian community has commanded such elections and ordinations to office to be made for the advantage of his cause and people, it may be said that persons so elected and set apart by men, have the authority of God in consequence of their receiving authority from his people to officiate for them.

All this may be illustrated by our civil institutions and what is said of them in the New Testament. The people of the United States choose and ordain their own rulers. The rulers do not create and ordain themselves. These rulers, elected and ordained by the people, are God's *ministers;* and are, by the ordination of the people, the ordinance of God. So teaches the great Apostle Paul. They are not God's ministers until appointed by the people, and the people choose and appoint them for themselves. "The powers that be are ordained by God." Romans xiii. 1.

More than enough for you, my dear sir, though not for some of my readers, has been advanced on this important view of ordination.

Digitized by Google

The advantages of this most ancient and venerable scheme are obvious and great. It lays the axe to the root of that accursed tree of ecclesiastic despotism, growing out of a self-created religious aristocracy, which has scourged christendom with a whip of scorpions for more than a thousand years.

In the second place, it not only prostrates the existing dynasties, but prevents effectually the rise of a new one: for all dynasties imply a sort of distinct and privileged class, with hereditary rights, and the power of perpetuating itself—which is wholly alien from this system.

In the third place, this most simple and rational system relieves us from all the perplexities and conscientious embarassments incident upon the examination of the moth eaten records of ecclesiastic genealogies, in tracing our ministers who "dispense to us the ordinances" through so many leaky and broken vessels, up to the first Roman prelate, the Galilean fisherman! A matter, indeed, essential to the peace of conscience of those who verily believe in the doctrine of succession.

In the fourth place, as direct authority is always preferable to indirect, we, choosing and ordaining our bishops, have, without succession, direct from the Lord all the divine authority which he vouchsafes to any institution bestowed on man in this present world.

And let me only add a fifth advantage of much value. In thus electing and ordaining from among ourselves persons whom we have often and long proved faithful, we have much more confidence in them, and can feel more sensibly our obligations to submit to their *episcopacy*, and their responsibility to the Lord and to us, from our choice and covenant with them, than we could have or feel in bishops created and made at a distance from us and without our agency.

I can anticipate some of your objections: but relying on your great candor, I can leave these remarks with you for a whole moon, without farther illustration or confirmation.

With the highest respect, as ever yours, &c.

EDITOR.

Political Reverends.

THE following philippic on those preachers, who, forgetful of their high calling, descend into the political arena, and seek to transfer their influence, gained in the cause of the Redeemer, to some political aspirant, is worthy the attention, perhaps, of some of our own brethren, who, thoughtlessly, in some unguarded hour, may have turned aside to electioneer for some great hero other than the Captain of our salvation. It is from the pen of *Charles Hammond*, Esq. of Cincinnati, a gentleman eagle-eyed in discovering all defects in the clergy, and whose opinions of men and things are very generally as sound and consistent as those of any other Editor in the country. We have, indeed, frequently observed that those religious teachers

Digitized by Google

who devote much attention to politics, and especially to promote some great political candidate, lose all their influence in the kingdom of Jesus Christ. ED. M. H.

"POLITICAL REVEREND.—We have of late observed that an unusual number of 'Reverend' gentlemen have, in one way or another, been brought out to play a part in the politics of the day. A number of them have in some sort, been the whitewashers of —— ——— ——— ———, candidate for ——— ——— ———. Is the political arena their proper field of action? If they *are* what they *should be*, we answer that it is not; but if they are all like their leader, the Rev. O. B. B——, they have not mistaken the field of their labors. They are seeking their reward, not in heaven, but in a division of the spoils of victory. Public sentiment does, and ought to sustain the clergy of every denomination, while they labor in their appropriate sphere, no matter how heretical or absurd their sentiments may be to others; but when the clergyman is sunk in the character and conduct of a political scavenger and brawling demagogue, he forfeits all claim to respect and confidence. The last volunteer among these reverend gentlemen that we have noticed, is the Rev. J. G——, of Tennessee. The 'Union' speaks of him as the *venerable* James G——. We hope that the *venerable* gentleman will act in obedience to his calling, and turn away from the beggarly elements of the world, and seek to renew the 'works of his first love.' His democracy will cut a sorry figure, and avail him but little in the settlement of his *stewardship* in the day of final account."

The Crisis.

THE dangers which at this time threaten the progress and prosperity of the cause which so many of us are now pleading, ought to be distinctly stated by the watchmen on our walls, and guarded against by all our associates in this glorious struggle for the restoration of ancient and primitive christianity. In conclusion of the present volume, and of the thirteenth year of our editorial labors, we feel it an imperious duty to the Lord, to our brethren, and to the public, to make a full and candid avowal of our whole views of things as they are, and are likely to be amongst the churches which have embraced this great and good cause, or which have grown up under its influence.

From the best estimates we can make from all the documents in our possession, the advocates of this cause in the United States alone do not much, if at all, fall short of one hundred and fifty thousand; for we regard every one who has enlisted under the banners of the restoration of original christianity as an advocate of the cause. This, for the period of time in which the cause has been plead, is much more than could have been expected by its most sanguine friends. Perhaps no cause so unadequately plead, and so powerfully opposed,

Digitized by Google

has, at least in modern times, moved forward with greater power and progress. Had it not been for its overwhelming evidence, it could not have sustained itself against the want of concert and co-operation and occasional mismanagement in the ranks of its warmest friends, to say nothing of the ten thousand calumnies, reproaches, misrepresentations, and detractions of its opponents. It appears indeed, to us the Lord's doings, and it is marvellous in our eyes.

We always felt, in some measure, that which we now feel certain as the connexion between cause and effect, that we have every thing to fear from its friends, and nothing from its unfortunate opponents. Truth may be betrayed into the hand of its enemies, otherwise it cannot be conquered. But our present object is to point out the dangers that in our horizon appear to us most worthy of immediate attention. We shall arrange them, not in their relative magnitude, but as they occur to our recollections:—

1. The cause which our brethren plead is often represented, and is likely to be regarded by many, as though it were a sort of family quarrel among the Baptists—a contention in one sect about certain questions of its law and proceedings—much in the light of the dissensions amongst the Presbyterians concerning New School and Old School doctrines; or amongst the Quakers, Methodists, and others, on their respective dogmas, whether concerning doctrine, discipline, or government.

We would not be understood as intimating that any of our brethren intentionally hold up the subject in this light to the public; but they give countenance to the imputation by directing more of their attention to that party than to any other, in the way of defence against its accusations; and by going more into an exposition of the frailties of its doctrine and administration. In this way some of our brethren appear to have a peculiar controversy with the Baptists, and encourage the belief that it is some family feud, or sectarian bickering,—rather than a new foundation, or the laying again of the old foundation laid by the Apostles.

The christian cause was in fact injured in the same way at first—especially among the Gentiles. It was said abroad, and the frequent debates with the Jews gave speciosity to the allegation, that the gospel and christianity was a new schism amongst the Jews in Judea—one of the numerous *isms* hatched in that fruitful and disputatious soil. The more philosophic opponents of the gospel gave this color and appearance to the whole affair, and expatiated on the frequent rencounters of Paul and the Jews as decisive proof of the correctness of their allegata. This, we are assured, is, to a certain extent, true of the cause we plead, and it is as unpropitious to its success as were the insinuations of a Tacitus or a Celsus against the old Apostles' doctrine. Perhaps there are some of our brethren who do themselves regard it in no higher point of view. It is high time that the public were disabused of this deleterious mistake.

Like every other cause, it began to be first plead amongst some people, just as there must be time and place for every commencement

Digitized by Google

in human affairs. But however it may be regarded by many of its friends or its enemies, it ought to be known that such is not the true history of its commencement—such were not the views of the prime movers in this great and radical change of the religious views of society. It rather, indeed, in point of fact, began among the Presbyterians, than among the Baptists; but we have sufficient fact and documental evidence to satisfy the most slow to understand that the reformation of no one party in christendom was the original intention of the first advocates of the original gospel and order of things. When, in the year 1813, the right hand of fellowship was extended to us by the Redstone Baptist Association of Western Pennsylvania, *it was upon a full and explicit written declaration on our part, that we aimed at making the New Institution, without creed or catechism, the only rule of faith and manners; accompanied with a cordial and unequivocal declaration and remonstrance against all humanisms in religion* .For the express purpose of strengthening the cause of reformation, we formed a connexion with the Regular Baptists, never approving of all their opinions and views, but agreeing with them in most of the cardinal matters in which they differed from Presbyterians.

Although much enlarged in our conceptions of the sacred writings, and of the present state of the professing communities since that time, we have not in these matters materially changed either our views or course. Determined to hold as private property all opinions, and to contend only for *the faith* formerly delivered to the saints, we are willing to co-operate with all lovers of the truth in the restoration of a pure speech and of the christian institution in its original purity and simplicity. But be it distinctly and emphatically noted, that it is not a reformation of the Baptists, nor of any party, as such, but the gathering together into one community, under the Apostles' teaching, upon the foundation that Jesus is the Son of God and the Messiah, all those of every sect and nation, who are determined for eternal life and resolved to obey Jesus Christ in all things. Let, then, all who advocate this great Bible, and catholic, and holy cause, guard against every word and action that would give it the appearance of a sectarian project of reforming the Baptists, or Bible Christians, or Presbyterians. Let us not talk of the "Old Baptists," and the "Reformed Baptists"—of Old Lights or New Lights; but let us plead the cause of Christ and the disciples of Christ. Let us contend only for that sect of disciples called "christians first at Antioch." Here we began, and here let us end.

2. Nearly allied to the former, though specially distinct from it, is the *anticalvinian* character which some of our writers and speakers give to the cause of the restoration. They seem to glory in its anticalvinistic attributes. This would be, if fixed upon our banners, a great injury to the cause. The cause we plead is no more anticalvinian than antiarminian. It is a more ancient and more venerable faith for which we contend, and ought not to be compared nor contrasted, nor identified with any one of the systems of the last thousand years. Calvinism, as a system of religious philosophy, taken as a whole, in

Digitized by Google

the moderated tone of the present century, is, perhaps, as good a system of religious philosophy as arminianism. At all events, if I could dissect my own speculations, I opine there would be more of John Calvin than of James Arminius in my moral philosophy; and I think it is so with the great majoriry of all our public advocates as far as I am intimately acquainted with their opinions. If this be so, and whether it be so or not, it is ill-advised, imprudent, and highly injurious to the gospel we preach, to prepossess against it all that class of religionists who have been taught in the calvinian system, by giving to it an anticalvinistic character. The battles of Calvin and Arminius we ought not to fight over again; and, therefore, it would be extremely unwise to represent, by any word or action of ours, that this cause is peculiarly allied to arminianism and opposed to calvinism. We have nothing to do with human systems, and ought not to retard our chariot wheels by the friction of the calvinian or arminian *five points*. With Paul and Peter, and James and John in our hands, what have we to do with the speculations of these uninspired men! Let none of our brethren represent this good cause as antiarminian or anticalvinian—as making a common cause with any sect or party or human system in christendom; but as contending for Bibleism against all other *isms* ancient and modern.

3. A third danger which we have noticed, and as much to be deprecated as either of the former, is found in the *antitrinitarian* character which some of our opponents, countenanced, perhaps, by the speculations of some of our friends, have bestowed on our pleadings for the testimony of the Apostles. A unitarian to the east, some time since, in speaking of the progress of his favorite philosophy, represented our brethren under the designation of "a large class of Reformers in the West," as "decidedly antitrinitarian in their views." This is one of the numerous ways of lying with the truth in one's mouth, though in this case it may have been wholly unintentional on the part of the writer alluded to. It was, however, giving a false impression to the reader; for, in the popular and sectarian sense, he must have understood this "large class of Reformers in the West" as either unitarian or strongly leaning that way. Now is this the fact? No, assuredly; for if our brethren are antitrinitarian, they are most certainly still more antiunitarian in its sectarian definition. This incident illustrates the great detriment that "the Apostles' doctrine" may receive by associating it with, or by giving it a peculiar bias against, any one of these human religions. If a brother make an assault on calvinism *in propria persona*, and in due form, the arminian rejoices and says, Well done, my good brother; if on arminianism, the calvinist listens with delight, and says in his heart, This man has done nothing worthy of death or of bonds, and so of every other leading system of speculative theology in this age and country.

John Wesley, at one time addressing his brethren, said, "Are we not leaning too much to calvinism?" This was extremely impolitic and injurious. Had I been at his elbow I would have said, 'Friend John, are you not leaning too much to arminianism?'

Digitized by Google

Enough is said to show the perpendicular attitude which every advocate of this good cause should sustain in passing through the alien camps of this militant sectarian age. If, for the sake of illustration, allusion is ever made to any speculative system of theology, or to any sect, care should be taken to show no more affection for, nor enmity against, its antagonist system or party. This is prudent, righteous, and due to the awful and solemn responsibilities we assume in pleading only and professedly for the testimony of the holy Twelve. In respect to all these systems, creeds, and parties, we must inflexibly sustain the neutral character.

4. When we survey the whole phalanx of our fellow-laborers, the variety of talent, information, and influence which they bring into the field—the number of those who speak and write for the cause—the little opportunities they have for intimate acquaintance with one another—their liability to extremes —some from youth and inexperience, and some from age and obstinacy; some from too little reading and some from too much; some from an ardent, others from a phlegmatic temperament—without any controlling influence but the Bible, and many of them but little versed in the science of men and things, we cannot conceal our fears that *on questions of expediency* difficulties may arise which might greatly jeopardize and retard the triumphant march of the regenerating truth. This is the ground, which, on a survey of all our walls and bulwarks, is the least susceptible of fortification. We have all well digested the bond of union, and the place which matters purely speculative must occupy. We can have no difficulty on "the one Lord, the one faith, the one baptism, the one Spirit, the one body, the one hope, and the one God and Father of all;" but questions of expediency, like that between Paul and Barnabas—like that of Paul's circumcising Timothy, or that of his shaving his head, purifying himself, and being at charges with certain persons who had a vow upon them in Jerusalem, may arise; and without "the wisdom from above," which is always "pure, peaceable, gentle, *easy to be entreated*," difficulties and perplexities may—nay, must arise. The only defence which the New Testament presents against these liabilities is, that the younger submit to the elder—the minority to the majority—and that all submit one to another. The wisdom of ages and the experience of all generations can furnish no other defence against the excesses which may arise where perfect freedom of thought, liberty of speech and of action are recognized and acted out. This spirit of love and of a sound mind, this preferring one another in honor, this supreme respect for union, harmony, and co-operation, will do more to bind indissolubly the christian church, than all the parchments, written creeds, and covenants ever invented. Without the christian spirit, without the golden chain of christian affection, all such instruments are like the flaxen threads with which the Philistines would have bound Sampson in his strength, or like "the tow that falls asunder at the touch of fire." "Many waters cannot quench love, neither can the floods drown it. Were a person to give all the substance of his house in lieu of it, it would be utterly contemned."

Digitized by Google

When any question of expediency arises, when any difference of opinion occurs, let all remember that union, and love, and co-operation are worth more than all our views of expediency and all our opinions on all speculative and doubtful subjects—that even the appearance of division would do more injury than all that could be gained by forcing a matter by sheer strength of argument against the reasons and views of even a respectable minority.

5. There is yet another detriment of which we have too much experience: the dogmatical, unfeeling, and snarling temper sometimes displayed by certain proclaimers when they speak of errors and errorists, of creeds and sects—when they denounce error rather than preach the gospel. We rejoice to see that this evil genius, which provokes the worst passions in human nature, and seals in impenetrable deafness the ears of the public, is fast passing into general contempt. Those proclaimers begin to be most appreciated who gather the largest audiences, and leave the most unambiguous impressions on the minds of their auditors that they are not mere actors on the stage, but that they feel for sinners, and have bowels of compassion as well as enlightened understandings; and, like Paul, are more profuse of tears than of jests and sarcasms. We cannot say that this blighting and blasting spirit at present much disturbs us; for from all quarters we hear that it is wholly out of credit with the brethren, and that the preachers once addicted to it are ashamed of it, and shamed out of it.

6. Under the same head, and as a verse of the same chapter, we would advise that the white horse which carries the message of peace, should not be broken down by carrying heavy loads of declamation against Temperance Societies, Bible and Missionary co-operations; and still less, by taking on the saddlebags of party politics and political aspirants.

There is great need of some well digested plan of promoting the edification of many infant churches in this country, and of forwarding a more energetic proclamation of the gospel, to which we shall call the attention of the brethren, God willing, in our next volume. Meanwhile, we would especially entreat all the beloved disciples of our Lord, devoted to this greatest and best of causes to consider well all these matters; and let all the watchmen be on their towers to espy all dangers and to guard against them, that they may protect the sheep and the lambs of Christ's flock from all danger, and that each may be addressed by the great Shepherd with this transporting salutation, "Well done, good and faithful servant!" EDITOR.

Preaching from Envy.

"Some, indeed, preach Christ even of envy and strife, and some also of good will. The former preach Christ out of contention, not sincerely, thinking to add affliction to my bonds; the latter from love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the gospel."—Phil. i. 15, 16, 17.

Query—What is it to preach Christ out of strife and envy?

B. *Trumbull, Ohio.*

Digitized by Google

IN our own days we have a few of these self-same preachers of whom Paul complains. We have unfortunately contracted a style of conversation by the fireside (from which hallowed spot radiate much of the social weal or woe of man, religious and political) most injurious to religion and morality. In this, alas! too popular style, we hear our grave superiors, of reputed good sense, extol this man's and that man's prodigious talents, as if he was the author and maker of himself. Instead of gratefully admiring the donor of all these good gifts to men, the men themselves are spoken of in such a style as to induce the thoughtless listener almost to worship them because of the powers which God has vouchsafed them. The lesser minds become envious of this distinction; and one says, 'Oh! that I could preach like Paul!' and 'Oh! that I could preach like Apollos!' exclaims another. These youngsters imagine that this way to honor is more accessible to them than any other. Besides, there is a sort of pious fascination accompanying this distinction, to which the soul of the mere aspirant after political glory is a perfect stranger. Thus the ambition of some youths is fired by the praises which their good uncles and aunts, fathers and mothers bestow upon the talents and acquisitions of their favorite preachers; and charmed no little with the sanctity which peculiarly attaches to this sacred honor, they begin to feel "*a call* to the sacred ministry," or an inward longing after occupying so large and so sacred a space in public admiration, as 'the Reverend, and talented, and learned Mr. Such-a-one.' Thus their minds are first fired with the religious ambition of becoming *good* and *great* men; good by becoming great, instead of great by becoming good. Thus the grammar school, then the college, and finally the school of theology is entered by these young Levites who have consecrated themselves to the sacred desk, and seek the pre-eminence which first allured them to think of the sacred office. In the rapid and constant march of time these years of preparation have performed their circuits, and forthwith steps this sacred novice into the midst of the wondering congregation. Soon as his first fruits are uttered, his ear is all attention to catch the returning echo of the judgment of his audience; and should it be a favorable one and big with future promise, he grows exceedingly in his own estimation, blesses his propitious stars, and prepares himself for receiving the large revenue of the golden honors, which, in gilded majesty, begin to appear in the remote verge of his horizon. He toils and labors to deserve the first place, the highest niche in the synagogue of the sainted Rabbis of his own times. This he pursues by placing before him in detail this great man and that, till in his judgment he equals this and surpasses that, and now he fills to its circumference the circle which once in his boyhood his imagination sketched as the goal of his ambition, 'Verily, he has received his reward.' Such a preacher is all his life preaching Christ, or something else, from strife and envy.

Such, however, is not the only one—nor, perhaps, at all, the one that fills the character our Apostle had in his view; but such a one will prepare our minds to understand in general terms what it is to

Digitized by Google

preach from strife and envy. We imagine we have sometimes seen even amongst unlettered orators, a character that still more closely resembles those persons that vexed the writer of the letter to the Philippians. Here stands a great preacher, who unfortunately eclipses all my honors—I must try and surpass him: for this purpose I read those authors whose language, style, and sentiments may elevate and improve mine—I read and study the Bible that I may be able to quote it fluently and pertinently on all proper occasions. I take the dimensions of his fame and of his powers, and I aim at equalling him in this, and surpassing him in that, if by any means I may turn the current of admiration from him to myself. This is still more emphatically to preach Christ from strife and envy, and comes, in our judgment, very nigh fitting those persons of whom Paul complains to the Philippians.

I would not be understood as intimating that this is exactly or exclusively, what our Apostle has in view, but as coming fairly within the scope of the language which he employs in the passage under consideration. We must attend to some incidents in his own biography to understand his allusions in the case before us. Paul, like all great men, was not out of the reach of envy. Moses himself was envied by some of the very people that he himself led out of Egypt. Paul also was envied, by persons whom he himself converted, and by some who, in the ardor of their first love, would have plucked out their eyes and given them to him. Some, from envy at his standing, even went so far as to assail his reputation as an Apostle of the Lord, and sought to lessen him in the estimation of the brotherhood, that they might exalt themselves. No wonder, then, that such preachers would, from envy and contention, preach in the regions of Paul's labors. Such persons did not *sincerely* preach Christ, either from love to Paul or to Christ; but so far as Christ was preached, though in a manner to afflict Paul, still he rejoiced in the fact that Christ was proclaimed.

A *sincere* preacher of Christ, in Paul's version of that word, is one that preaches Christ from unmixed love to him; and an insincere preacher is one that preaches Christ from love to himself or from any sinister motive springing from selfishness. Those who from an *envious*, which is always a *contentious* spirit, preach the gospel, are not *sincere* preachers; and although good may result from their labors, still they cannot be honored or rewarded as those who, from pure devotion to Christ and his people, announce his gospel to the world.

EDITOR.

Change of Dispensation.

JAMESTOWN, November 9, 1835.

Dear brother Campbell,

I AM now reading "CHRISTIANITY RESTORED"—have just laid down the book after having read your Essay on the Kingdom of

Digitized by Google

Heaven. You know that I was one of those who affirmed that the kingdom was set up by John the Baptist; but I was examining, a week or two past, for the purpose of proving that the kingdom had been handed over by Jesus to the Apostles, and that he had given to them power to *remit sins*, to *bind*, and to *loose*, and had given to them the *glory* which the Father had given to him: and while thus engaged I found many of the proofs adduced by you, and one in particular which you have barely mentioned *en passant*, to wit: Paul's position in the 7th chapter of Hebrews—"WHEREFORE THE PRIESTHOOD BEING CHANGED, THERE IS OF NECESSITY A CHANGE OF LAW."

Q.—Well, Paul, when did the change of the priesthood take place?

A.—'Look in the 8th chapter, and there I have distinctly told you that Jesus could not be a Priest while on the earth.' Why, Paul? '1st. Because it is very plain that our Lord has sprung from Judah, in relation to which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning priesthood. And 2d. Because there are Priests who offer gifts according to the law.' These things being so, it is very evident that the priesthood was not changed while Jesus remained upon the earth; and it is still more plain that the *law did not change* until after the change in the priesthood; for the change of the law depended upon the change of the priesthood.

This argument of Paul's was conclusive with me, and I gave up my former position, that John set up the kingdom, and that the law extended no farther than to his ministry. You have fully satisfied me in the Essay just read, that the Law and the Prophets only ceased as the *teachers* of men, and that *John* and *Jesus* became their *teachers*, instead of the *Law* and the *Prophets*; and after Jesus had received the kingdom the *Holy Spirit* was constituted the *teacher* of all things.

As ever, yours,

M. WINANS.

Great Men doing Worse than Nothing.

JAMESTOWN, Ohio, November 12, 1835.

Brother Campbell,

I HAVE just read a part of "*the Wine Controversy*" between Dr. W. B. SPRAGUE and PROFESSOR STEWART; and as far as I read, the Doctor had the *wind* of the Professor. But what astonished me was, that a man of the natural and acquired abilities of Professor Stewart, should be led away by such a cause as the "*Temperance*," so as to use sophisms to support a favorite scheme, such as that the *unfermented* juice of the grape was used in the Lord's Supper, or that the *diluted fermented* juice was used; whereas the Professor, with all his knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, could not determine whether the wine used by our Lord was *new* or *old*, or of what species of the grape it was made. The common sense man would say that the different kinds of grapes was the cause of different kinds of wine—just as different kinds of apples produce different kinds of cider.

Digitized by Google

But the Master said that such as drank *old* wine did not desire *new*, because the old was better; so that in his day old fermented wine was esteemed better than wine just from the press. And that made by him out of water, at the close of the wedding feast, was better than that which had been procured by the manager of the feast. But whether any were made drunk by it, or not, we are left t guess.

I was also a little surprised that a man who reasons as well as Dr. Sprague, should be found using the common-place objections to *new versions* of the Scriptures; such as that they have a tendency to unsettle the faith of men, or make sceptics of them. If this assertion were true, all learned men would be sceptics; but I think this old common-place saying has never been the fact. As far as I can judge from my very limited knowledge of the matter, the very reverse of this old saying is true. The *more versions* of the Scriptures that are read by men, the stronger their faith, and the less liable to be drawn about by every wind of doctrine. The more learned the man, the less sceptical he is.

Here, then, are two great men, both found using small things to support their favorite notions, or to uphold their favorite schemes. The one prefers sweet, or new wine, or diluted old wine, to be used in the Lord's Supper, to favor a "*temperance cause;*" the other prefers an "*old translation of the Scriptures, even if incorrect,*" so that men may be steady in their belief. It is not so material about the thing believed, as about the unwavering belief of it. So we go.

M. WINANS.

GROTIUS—AND J. CLARK, D. D., HIS TRANSLATOR.

GROTIUS' plan of defending the christian religion is found in the following preface to his works, published in 1717. We give the whole preface of the translator for the sake of another witness, great and learned, to our system of operations. Grotius wrote in Latin 200 years ago. The work was translated by J. Clark, D. D., and Dean of Sarum 118 years ago; and as far as I can judge, both from the preface and from a small work which I have perused, written by him on the question, *What church or party should one prefer*, he commends and enforces every cardinal principal of our writings on ancient and modern christianity. On this subject he says—"That sect of christians is to be preferred before all others, which does most of all defend those things which Christ and his Apostles taught. In a word, that is in every particular the christian religion, which, without any mixture of human invention, may be ascribed to Christ as the author." [Grotius on the Truth of the Christian Religion, page 269. London edition: 1827.] Dr. J. Clark constantly affirms that only the matters in which all agree—that is, in the matter of fact part of christianity, ought to be the bond of union.

ED M. H.

Digitized by Google

The general acceptation this piece of Grotius has met with in the world encouraged this translation of it, together with the notes, which, being a collection of the ancient testimonies, upon whose authority and truth the genuineness of the books of Holy Scripture depends, are very useful in order to the convincing any one of the truth of the Christian religion. These notes are for the most part Grotius' own, except some few of Mr. Le Clerc's, which I have, therefore, translated also, because I have followed his edition, as the most correct.

The design of the book is to show the reasonableness of believing and embracing the Christian religion above any other; which our author does, by laying before us all the evidence that can be brought, both internal and external, and declaring the sufficiency of it; by enumerating all the marks of genuineness in any books, and applying them to the sacred writings; and by making appear the deficiency of all other institutions of religion, whether Pagan, Jewish, or Mahometan. So that the substance of the whole is briefly this: That as certain as is the truth of natural principles, and that the mind can judge of what is agreeable to them; as certain as is the evidence of men's bodily senses, in the most plain and obvious matters of fact; and as certainly as men's integrity and sincerity may be discovered, and their accounts delivered down to posterity faithfully; so certain are we of the truth of the Christian religion; and that, if it be not true, there is no such thing as true religion in the world; neither was there ever, or can there ever be, any revelation proved to be from heaven.

This is the author's design, to prove the truth of the Christian religion in general, against Atheists, Deists, Jews, or Mahometans; and he does not enter into any of the disputes which Christians have among themselves, but confines himself wholly to the other. Now, as the state of Christianity at present is, were a heathen or Mahometan convinced of the truth of the Christian religion in general, he would yet be exceedingly at a loss to know what society of Christians to join himself with; so miserably divided are they amongst themselves, and separated into so many sects and parties which differ almost as widely from each other as heathens from Christians, and who are so zealous and contentious for their own particular opinions, and bear so much hatred and ill-will towards those that differ from them, that there is very little of the true spirit of charity, which is the bond of peace, to be found in any of them: this is a very great scandal to the professors of Christianity, and has been exceedingly disserviceable to the Christian religion: insomuch that great numbers have been hindered from embracing the gospel, and many tempted to cast it off, because they saw the professors of it in general agree so little amongst themselves: this consideration induced Mr. Le Clerc to add a seventh book to those of Grotius: wherein he treats of this matter, and shows what it becomes every honest man to do in such a case; and I have translated it for the same reason. All that I shall here add, shall be only briefly to inquire into the cause of so much division

Digitized by Google

in the church of Christ, and to show what seems to me the only remedy to heal it. First, to examine into the cause why the church of Christ is so much divided: A man needs but a little knowledge of the state of the Christian church, to see that there is just reason for the same complaint St. Paul made in the primitive times of the church of Corinth: that some were for Paul, some for Apollos, and some for Cephas; so very early did the spirit of faction creep into the church of God, and disturb the peace of it, by setting its members at variance with each other, who ought to have been all of the same common faith into which they were baptized; and I wish it could not be said that the same spirit has too much remained amongst Christians ever since. It is evident that the foundation of the divisions in the church of Corinth was their forsaking their common Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, into whose name alone they were baptized, and uniting themselves, some under one eminent Apostle or teacher, and some under another, by whom they had been instructed in the doctrine of Christ, whereby they were distinguished into different sects, under their several denominations: this St. Paul complains of as a thing in itself very bad, and of pernicious consequence; for hereby the body of Christ, that is, the Christian church, the doctrine of which is one and the same at all times and in all places, is rent and divided into several parts, that clash and interfere with each other; which is the only method, if permitted to have its natural effect, that can overthrow and destroy it. And from the same cause have arisen all the divisions that are or have been in the church ever since. Had Christians been contented to own but one Lord, even Jesus Christ, and made the doctrine delivered by him the sole rule of faith, without any fictions or inventions of men, it had been impossible but that the church of Christ must have been one universal, regular, uniform thing, and not such a mixture and confusion as we now behold it. But when Christians once began to establish doctrines of their own, and to impose them upon others by human authority, as rules of faith (which is the foundation of Antichrist,) then there began to be as many schemes of religion as there were parties of men who had different judgment, and got the power into their hands. A very little acquaintance with ecclesiastical history does but too sadly confirm the truth of this, by giving us an account of the several doctrines in fashion in the several ages of the Christian church, according to the present humor. And if it be not so now, how comes it to pass that the generality of Christians are so zealous for that scheme of religion which is received by that particular church of which they profess themselves members? How is it that the generality of Christians in one country are zealous for Calvinism, and in another country as zealous for Arminianism? It is not because men have any natural disposition more to one than the other, or perhaps that one has much more foundation to support it from Scripture than the other; but the reason is plain, viz. because they are the established doctrines of the places they live in; they are by authority made the rule and standard of religion, and men are taught them from the beginning: by this

Digitized by Google

means they are so deeply fixed and rooted in their minds that they become prejudiced in favor of them, and have so strong a relish of them, that they cannot read a chapter in the Bible, but it appears exactly agreeable to the received notions of them both, though perhaps those notions are directly contradictory to each other; thus, instead of making the Scripture the only rule of faith, men make rules of faith of their own, and interpret Scripture according to them; which being an easy way of coming to the knowledge of what they esteem the truth, the generality of Christians sit down very well satisfied with it. But whoever is, indeed, convinced of the truth of the gospel, and has any regard for the honor of it, cannot but be deeply concerned to see its sacred truths thus prostituted to the power and interests of men; and think it his duty to do the utmost he is able to take it out of their hands, and fix it on its own immoveable bottom. In order to contribute to which, I shall, in the second place, show what seems to be the only remedy that can heal these divisions amongst Christians; and that is, in one word, making the Scripture the only rule of faith. Whatever is necessary for a Christian to believe, in order to everlasting salvation, is there declared, in such a way and manner as the wisdom of God, who best knows the circumstances and conditions of mankind, has thought fit. This God himself has made the standard for all ranks or orders, for all capacities and abilities; and to set up any other above, or upon the level with it, is dishonoring God, and abusing of men. All the authority in the world cannot make any thing an article of faith, but what God has made so; neither can any power establish or impose upon men, more or less, or otherwise than what the Scripture commands. God has given every man proportionable faculties and abilities of mind, some stronger and some weaker; and he has by his own authority made the Scripture the rule of religion to them all; it is, therefore, their indispensable duty to examine diligently and study attentively this rule, to instruct themselves in the knowledge of religious truths from hence, and to form the best judgment they can of the nature of them. The Scripture will extend or contract itself according to the capacities of men; the strongest and largest understanding will there find enough to fill and improve it, and the narrowest and meanest capacity will fully acquiesce in what is there required of it. Thus all men are obliged to form a judgment of religion for themselves, and to be continually rectifying and improving it: they may be very helpful and assisting to each other in the means of coming to this divine knowledge, but no one can finally determine for another; every man must judge for himself; and for the sincerity of his judgment he is accountable to God only, who knows the secrets of all hearts, which are beyond the reach of human power: this must be left till the final day of account, when every man shall be acquitted or condemned, according as he has acted by the dictates of his conscience or no. Were all Christians to go upon this principle, we should soon see an end of all the fierce controversies and unhappy divisions which now rend and confound the church of Christ: were every man allowed to take the Scripture

Digitized by Google

for his only guide in matters of faith, and, after all the means of knowledge and instruction used, all the ways of assurance and conviction tried, permitted quietly to enjoy his own opinion, the foundation of all divisions would be taken away at once: and, till Christians do arrive at this temper of mind, let them not boast that they are endued with that excellent virtue of charity, which is the distinguishing mark of their profession; for, if what Paul says be true, that charity is greater than faith, it is evident no Christian ought to be guilty of the breach of a greater duty upon account of a lesser; they ought not to disturb that peace and unity which ought to be amongst all Christians, for the sake of any matters of faith, any differences of opinion; because it is contrary to the known law of charity: and how the far greatest part of Christians will clear themselves of transgressing this plain law, I know not. Wherefore, if ever we expect to have our petitions answered, when we pray that God would make us one flock under one Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, Jesus Christ, we must cease to make needless fences of our own, and to divide ourselves into small separate flocks, and distinguish them by that whereby Christ has not distinguished them. When this spirit of love and unity, of forbearing one another in meekness, once becomes the prevailing principle amongst Christians, then, and not till then, will the kingdom of Christ in its highest perfection and purity flourish upon the earth, and all the powers of darkness fall before it.

Progress of Reform.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

CAMDEN, *N. J.* November 20, 1835.

SINCE I had the pleasure of writing to you last, the Lord has been good to the Bank street congregation, and good to me. I have had the happiness of seeing my first child, a little girl, about 13 years of age, and a niece, a few years older, obey the gospel of Jesus, and unite with the disciples to walk in the institutions of the kingdom. Some time after their immersion for the remission of sins, we had the pleasure of seeing the niece's mother also obey the gospel. Brother Grew immersed them. And yesterday a young lady, the daughter of sister Litle, whom our beloved brother Elley immersed, was also buried by immersion into Christ's death, by brother Hunter, from the state of Maine, where he edits the 'Christian Investigator.' He will continue some time in this region of country. Brother Ferguson, from Shenandoah county, Va. is also with us at the present time.

The conference of churches which I anticipated when I wrote to you before, took place partially. The brethren Farquharson and Sweeney came from the church in Baltimore, but not clothed with any powers to act. The church in New York sent a letter declining to act in concert with us, on the ground of *opinions* entertained by brother Grew, until we should inform them whether we held the same opinions or not. Of course we could not comply with the demand for a "*confession*" of our views or sentiments. We briefly replied, that we received the whole teaching of our heavenly Father, the teaching of Christ and his Apostles—that with brother Grew's opinions we

Digitized by Google

had nothing to do, so long as he did not trouble the church with them; and so little had he done this, that it was doubtful whether many in our church knew of a difference until their letter was read; that those of us who did know of them entirely dissented from his particular views, &c. &c. The brethren present talked over the matter, and agreed as to the importance of doing something in this eastern section of our union. The brethren from Baltimore, however, thought they had as much to do within their own state as they could undertake for the present; and not being authorized to act, the matter, so far as co-operation is concerned, remains open to further conference. We will not disguise the fact, however, that we are all as much opposed to *hireling proclaimers* as we are to *hireling priests;* and while we believe that they who publish the gospel should live of the gospel, we have no warrant for stipulated sums or salaries, and are sorry to see an itching for these Babylonish relics among the reformers. Are the disciples under the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles so craven-hearted and parsimonous that they must pledge a specific sum before they can be trusted for the support and comfort of those who nobly step forward to make known the message of life to a dying world? Forbid it, gratitude—forbid it, Heaven. If the teaching of the Apostles has its proper influence on proclaimers and on the whole body of the disciples, there can certainly be no lack on the part of the one or the other. But there must be a mutual confidence between those who preach and those who send, and a mutual reliance on the good providence of our heavenly Father, for a supply of the comforts of life while engaged in his holy and delightful service.

If professed disciples apostatize from this principle of their faith, let them be repudiated; but let not the principle be abandoned. Let the proclaimers depend on the word of the living God and the liberality of the brethren and let the word of the Lord go forth: it *will* accomplish that which he pleases, and *shall* prosper in the thing whereto he sent it. If the disciples refuse their aid, help shall arise from some other quarter. How can it be incompatible with the proclamation of the gospel that the proclaimer shall be employed in some lawful business in the neighborhood where he makes known the truth? If he be sent away from his business, every item of his expense, including loss of time, ought to be defrayed by the disciples who send him, and receive him: further than this we cannot see that the gospel teaches.

The congregation in Bank street, (running from Market street, between Second and Third streets,) Philadelphia, have agreed to add to their collections, as the Lord may prosper them, that they may have wherewith to supply the wants of those brethren who may come among them in the name of the Lord, for the purpose of making known his will among the sons of men. We shall be extremely happy to see any of the brethren from the West and South, or elsewhere, and will strive to make their sojourn among us pleasant, agreeable and useful. If one or more brethren, of popular talents, could find it in their hearts to come and combat the Lord's enemies in this place, I think they would never find cause to regret it; they would gain imperishable laurels in the King's service, and find stars to shine in the crown of rejoicing forevermore.

J. L. RHEES.

FAYETTE COUNTY, *Ind.* October 23, 1835.

SOMETIME ago I gave you a hasty sketch of having united with a few brethren for the purpose of breaking the loaf every Lord's day; but, as well as I recollect, I gave no reasons why we did not unite ourselves to some one of the congregations of the Lord around us. You must know, beloved brother, that the churches met at so remote a distance from our houses, that it made it almost impracticable for us to attend them with punctuality—indeed, the major part of our families were almost precluded the privilege of uniting with the disciples to remember the Lord Jesus in the breaking of the loaf. We, therefore, were compelled from necessity (unless we had attended it as the *monthly* participants do) and for our own convenience, to adopt the plan we did. I have the pleasure to state, that so far we have not had occasion to

Digitized by Google

repent of the measure. We have a meeting house in Danville to worship in, where we meet statedly to break the loaf every Lord's day, read the Scriptures, and edify one another. We have the assistance of the proclaimers occasionally—indeed, brethren R. T. Brown and John O'Kane visit us frequently. The latter brother devotes one Lord's day in each month to the preaching the gospel to the world, at our place of meeting; and I know it will afford you pleasure to learn that since ten persons formed the resolution to meet together to walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, we have had many more accessions to the church than we fondly anticipated. We now number thirty members, and all since the 29th day of last May. Brethren Brown, O'Kane, and myself have introduced into the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ upwards of thirty persons, a larger number than has been immersed for twelve months previous, and the work is still progressing, thanks to the Lord!

The disciples take a more lively interest in the conversion of men, at this time, than they did some time back. The Flat Rock Church, of which brother J. P. Thompson is one of the bishops, about three miles from us, have had some added by immersion. Indeed, I am happy to say that there is a united effort among the brethren for the promotion of the gospel, and I hope that the day is not far distant, when, throughout this region, there will be no occasion to say, "Know the Lord" to any person.

I attended a big meeting in Cincinnati last Lord's day week, where several obeyed the gospel. A singular occurrence took place there:—A young man and woman, from the neighborhood of Carthage, came in Lord's day morning to be married. Brother Fall that morning addressed the congregation; after which an invitation was given for any person present, desirous of obeying the gospel, to come forward. This young man and woman, and two young ladies, her companions, stepped forward—during the interval of meeting they were married—in the afternoon they were immersed. Thus in the same day they gave themselves to one another in holy matrimony, and gave themselves to the Lord. This, I think, is beginning the world well. May the Lord bless them!

JOHN THOMAS, Jun.

WELLSBURG, *Va.* November 20, 1835.

I AM now on my return from Wood county. I have had a joyful time. I found the disciples walking in the truth. They had not been addressed by any brother in the reformation since I left them last Spring: but I was happy to see, that instead of abandoning the cause on account of having no preaching, they had grown in grace and in the knowledge of the truth. I tarried with them ten days—spoke twelve times—and immersed ten persons. The brethren and the public remunerated me for my labors; and I, on the day before yesterday, left them with a good deal of regret. I never saw a better prospect of doing good. I do think if I had remained there only one month, I could have immersed one hundred. I was earnestly solicited to spend the Winter in Wood county. I could not easily get away without promising the people that I would either return myself, or get some other person to go among them and spend his time in preaching. They will be liberal in supporting laborers, and I hope some one will listen to their voice.

WARRICK MARTIN.

CLAY, Ononda county, *N. Y.* November 4, 1835.

LAST Monday evening we closed a three days' meeting with the brethren in Pompey. We had a good time. Eight volunteered in the service of Immanuel our Prince. The disciples are doing very well in Pompey. They have opposition enough to make them love one another. It is of a very hostile character. There was at the same time a consultation among the brethren on the subject of co-operation for the spread of truth. After considerable conversation, it was thought most congenial with the new institution to form no more extensive combinations than were necessary to sustain one public teach-

Digitized by Google

er. If one congregation is able of itself to sustain one, their duty is to do so. If one is not able to do so, then so many co-operate as necessary to do it. The brethren are jealous of their liberties: "A burnt child dreads the fire." I I think the cause will advance in this region. J. M. BARTLETT.

NOTTINGHAM, Harrison county, *Ohio*, November 23, 1835.

IN Coshocton county many attended to hear the word of reconciliation. Two made the good confession and were baptized for remission, and several were won over from the sects. Elders Parkar and Snow are laboring with much success in that region. I expect to organize a new congregation ten miles south-west of Coshocton in a few weeks. The prospect is truly flattering. In Guernsey county I found the cause languishing for the want of able evangelists. In Belmont county the disciples are much engaged in the good cause. Additions are often made to the various congregations. In this place (Nottingham) we have seen much of the goodness of the Lord, whose tender mercies are over the works of his hands. I continue to baptize and receive from the surrounding sects occasionally. Praised be the name of the Lord!

ROBERT COOK.

From the Gospel Advocate.

CONQUESTS OF THE GOSPEL.

ON the fourth Lord's day in October our beloved and talented brother, T. Fanning, addressed the congregation in Georgetown, and Captain *Warren*, of the United States Navy, his wife, and daughter were immersed. They spent the Summer in Georgetown; and though they had not previously heard the ancient gospel, they soon embraced the truth. Like the Corinthians, they heard, believed, and were immersed.

Brother T. Smith, of Garrard county, writes us, October 21, that he and brother J. Creath, Jun. had a four days' meeting at Antioch, in that county, in September. Twenty were immersed, and two from the Baptists united with the brethren. Brother Smith immersed two at the Forks of Elkhorn the third Lord's day in October.

Brother O. Austin writes us, New Albany, Indiana, October 2, "Since I last wrote you twenty-two more have been immersed, among them were several Methodists. Also, four or five Baptists have united with us. Brother D. S. Burnet is with us. In May last, when the brethren came out from the Baptists, they numbered forty. Since that time ninety more have come in."

Brother D. S. Burnet, of Cincinnati, Ohio, writes, October 13, "Last Lord's day I immersed five persons, and Monday three. Last week there were twenty immersed at Dayton."

On the fourth Lord's day in September, J. T. Johnson attended a three days' meeting at Lawrenceburg with brethren J. R. M'Call and J. P. Lancaster; where eleven came forward—one, a Methodist lady, had already been immersed, and was the mother-in-law of brother Lancaster.

WINCHESTER, Tennessee.

AT a four days meeting near this place, including the 2d Lord's day in this month, attended by brethren J. C. Anderson and T. V. Griffin, thirteen were immersed; two more made the good confession, who expect to be immersed shortly; two from the Baptists united, and one more last Saturday.

Your brother in the Lord, J. CALAHAN.

Reminiscences of 1835.

Dear brother Campbell,

ANOTHER season has elapsed since I had the pleasure of seeing you at Bethany. The snows of Winter, and the flowers of Spring: Summer with its burning suns, and Autumn with its fruits

Digitized by Google

have appeared in turn, and with all their varied influences have passed away. The yellow leaf has fallen, the gorgeous drapery of the woods, like the showy splendor of an ancient empire anterior to its dissolution, has disappeared, and the creeping ivy, and the mighty oak whose lofty trunk it lately clothed with crimson, are alike naked and bare. Amidst the different changes, however, to which we are constantly subjected, I am happy to discover that your former love for the truth has experienced no alteration, and that although "chill November's stormy blast" sweeps in triumph over the sad memorials of a more genial season, your zeal is as ardent and your pen as fruitful as ever. Hence while memory, importunate, recurs to former scenes, Fancy, annihilating time and space, renews the pleasures of the past, presenting again to me your hospitable mansion embosomed by lofty hills which shield it from the storm, permitting me once more to partake with the social circle around the cheerful hearth in happy and solemn conversation respecting the high matters of our holy religion, the love of Christ, the restoration of the gospel, and the salvation of the world

And who would not continue zealous in such a cause? Where shall we find a nobler theme than the redemption of men? Where a richer treasure than the gospel of salvation? and where a more exciting subject than the restoration of that gospel to its original purity and power? When, indeed, we reflect upon the history and condition of the world, how highly must we estimate the recovery of that which gives joy to the disconsolate, rest to the weary, riches to the poor, and life to the dead! It is an event full of interest and consolation. It is cheering to the soul as the bright shining of the morning sun after a dark and tempestuous night, or the haven of rest after the "billows of a stormy sea." It is like the return of the joyous Spring "when Winter is past and the rain is over and gone, when the time of the singing of birds is come and the voice of the turtle is heard." It is like the disinterment of a beautiful city which has been buried for ages beneath the ashes of a volcano. It is like a resurrection from the grave! Blessed be the name of the Lord who has vouchsafed to us so great a favor! whose loving kindnesses have been of old forever, and whose mercy endureth from generation to generation.

Nor is the recovery of ancient christianity interesting merely on account of the intrinsic value of the gospel and its relation to human happiness, but to us it is also endeared by the many pleasing associations to which it has given birth, the importance of the principles which led to its discovery, the means by which it has been spread abroad, the incidents which have attended its progress, and the glorious triumphs which it has achieved. Upon some of these permit me now towards the close of the year, since it is not at present permitted me to see you face to face, to offer, through this medium, a few reflections.

As to the principles, then, which led to the development of the gospel, may we not boldly affirm that they are the same which have guided and must forever guide men in the pursuit of truth of every

Digitized by Google

description? Let us for a few moments consider the nature of these rules and principles—let us contemplate the charms of Truth, the patroneos of the wise—the delight of the best and noblest of mankind in every age.

How beautiful, indeed, is Truth! Who is like to her among the daughters! Her features are comely, her form is divine, her robes are whiter than the snow. The purity of Heaven sits upon her brow, grace and dignity are in her steps, Peace and Joy, Virtue and Love are her companions. She frequents the simple cottage, the shady dell, or the calm retreat, and in that glorious temple erected by Nature and Religion she delights to worship the Divinity. It is here she presides, an infallible priestess, and hither the pure in heart come to dwell upon her perfections and obtain oracles that can never deceive. Happy, indeed, is he to whom she reveals herself in all her charms! Who can behold her without loving her! Who can love her without being happy! Falsehood may be compared to a base and gilded coin. Truth, on the other hand, is like rubies, and more precious than fine gold. Falsehood is the faint light, which, glimmering amid the darkness of the noisome fens, leads the unfortunate traveller to destruction. Truth is the radiant sun in Leo when he has gained the zenith and pours a flood of light upon the wanderer's path. Falsehood brings misfortune and misery in her train like the spreading pestilence or the wind of the desert—

——"the swift Simoom,
That harbinger of fate and gloom,
Beneath whose widely-wasting breath
The very cypress droops to death;
Dark tree! still sad when others' grief has fled,
The only constant mourner o'er the dead."

But Truth, like the odoriferous gales of Summer, imparts health and vigor, while she administers pleasure and delight.

Truth being herself without deceit, must always be approached with honesty of purpose and singleness of heart. It was once inquired by one of high renown, *What is truth?* but he who knew what was in man vouchsafed him no reply. That which is pure, must be received in a pure vessel, and truth would cease to be truth in the bosom of the faithless and the profane. To their nature Falsehood is more congenial; dissimulation and error are their delight. They are full of prejudice, their understandings are darkened, their hearts are gross, their eyes are distempered, they are unable to appreciate or even to discern the excellence of truth. For TRUTH—said the teacher of my early years, your venerable father—TRUTH IS THAT WHICH IS, FALSEHOOD IS THAT WHICH IS NOT. And these definitions are most just and philosophic. Who, then, can discover the true state of any matter who comes to the examination of it with partiality and prepossession? He who seeks that which is not, cannot possess himself of that which is.

Strange however as it may seem, it is not unfrequently the case that truth, notwithstanding its value and importance, becomes more

Digitized by Google

injurious to the possessor than either ignorance or falsehood. This happens *when there is a partial view of truth;* that is, *where a part of the truth only is known, and this part is regarded as the whole truth.* Allow me here to illustrate this proposition by the aid of history. Parysatis the mother, and Statira the wife of Artaxerxes king of Persia, after being long at enmity with each other affected to be reconciled, and were accustomed to eat as formerly at each others' apartments. Being suspicious, nevertheless, of each others' sincerity, they never partook but of the same dishes and pieces. Parysatis, one day when her daughter-in-law was at table with her, took an exquisite bird that was served up, cut it in two parts, gave one half to Statira and eat the other herself. Statira soon after was seized with sharp pains, and having quitted the table, died in the most horrible convulsions. In this instance it is evident that Statira was convinced the bird itself had not been poisoned, as she saw Parysatis herself partaking of it, and it was this conviction, which too was perfectly correct, which emboldened her to partake of it also. Had she been informed that it was poisoned, or had she been ignorant of its character, falsehood or ignorance might have saved her. She knew that the bird had not been tainted,—but she did not know that *one side of the knife* with which Parysatis divided it had been rubbed with poison, and thus lost her life from not being acquainted with the *whole truth.* Again: Our father Abraham, conceiving himself endangered by his wife's beauty during his travels, reported of her that she was his sister. In this case Abraham told *truth,* but it is well known what difficulties the kings of Egypt and of Gerar brought upon themselves by taking it for granted that this was the *whole truth* in the matter of their relationship. "What is this that thou hast done unto me?" said Pharaoh, "plagued with great plagues." "In what have I offended thee," said Abimelech, "that thou hast brought on me and on my kingdom a great sin? Thou hast done deeds unto me that ought not to be done." But it is unnecessary to multiply examples. Every one knows how dangerous a partial knowledge of truth is in all cases where just conclusions are required. Thus in trial by jury how fatal would partial testimony be to justice or the accused! Hence it is that witnesses are solemnly adjured to tell not merely the truth, but the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

It is, indeed, to partial and imperfect views of truth that the mistakes and misfortunes of men are chiefly owing. There is, perhaps, no system or theory, however injurious in its consequences, which does not contain truth. Even the system of Mr. Owen, with its unhappy tendencies, is founded in some measure upon correct principles, and his "casket" is deficient not because his "gems" are counterfeit, but because they are too few in number, and of a common and inferior species. The ruby and the diamond are wanting. He pays no regard whatever to the most noble part of human nature, the intellectual, but adapting his system to the animal constitution alone, has introduced no principles which are not, as you have ably shown in your debate, equally applicable to a goat.

Digitized by Google

Men are prone to act precipitately, and it is remarkable how strong a disposition there is in the human mind to take a part for the whole, to enhance the value of single facts, or truths, or principles, and filled with an overweaning conceit of their supreme importance, build upon them the most erroneous theories and systems. A part of truth, indeed, when taken for the whole, is converted into an absolute falsehood. Thus it is truth to say the globe which we inhabit is composed of earth, or, if you please, of land and water. But it is a falsity to affirm it is made of earth *alone* or land and water *alone*. Or it is true that we are saved by faith or by faith and grace, but to say that we are saved by faith alone or by faith and grace alone is to speak falsely; for it takes many things to make a world, and many things to make a christian, the blood of Christ, the Holy Spirit, reformation, obedience, &c. being equally connected with our salvation.

To build theories, then, upon isolated facts, to mistake a part for the whole, and come to positive conclusions from an imperfect acquaintance with truth, is imprudent, unwise, and dangerous. A certain Greek author speaks of a man who having a brick house to sell, carried about a brick taken from the house as a sample of the edifice! He who decides from a partial knowledge of truth is like the man who would purchase a building from seeing such a specimen.

Nor is it without equal reason that truth should be kept free from addition and adulteration. Like the waters of the crystal fountain, whose clearness may be diminished but not improved, truth can receive no addition without impurity. The standard measure will as certainly cease to be true when we increase its size, as when we diminish it. A man born without eyes would not be a greater curiosity than the fabled Argus, nor would one without hands be a greater monster than Briareus.

There is yet another matter connected with the investigation of truth which merits some attention. It is this: that distinct truths and different subjects should never be mingled or confounded together. A neglect of this rule is a very common source of error. It is productive of inconsistency, and occasions combinations as incongruous as that of a Sphinx or Centaur. It is to this we have been indebted for the commingling of the Jewish and Christian institutions, for such anomalous mixtures as "Christian Sabbaths," and for a priesthood derived more from Levi than from Christ.

These, then, are the rules and principles which must forever guide those who would possess themselves of any species of truth. Singleness of purpose, a determination to secure the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and to permit every truth to occupy its natural or legitimate position. And these are the very principles which led to the discovery and restoration of the gospel. These are the very rules which have guided your course in the pursuit of that inestimable treasure which is emphatically called "THE TRUTH."—An object indeed worthy of supreme regard. For if truth in general

Digitized by Google

be so important an acquisition; if the truths of nature, science, and the arts be worthy of such high esteem, how much more so those of eternal and abiding interest? Religion! thou angel of celestial light! Thou spirit of bright expanded wing! How infinitely glorious are thy rewards! How dear thy consolations!

"Faith saw thee by that fountain clear,
Which issues from the throne above,
Where mercy stoops our plaints to hear,
Where flow the streams of sacred love;
The jasper skies irradiate shine
By thy celestial rays divine.

The harp of Patmos sang for thee,
When lo! the Prophet's raptur'd soul
Beheld with joyful ecstacy,
The bursting visions o'er him roll:
He sang and panted for the skies,
Lost to behold thy grandeur rise.

To thee their pæans angels sung
Before primeval light arose,
Or dropp'd a note from mortal tongue,
Or blush'd in beauteous tints the rose:
Thy presence makes the bliss of heav'n—
The greatest joy to mortals giv'n.

In Paradise thy charms were known,
Where first the morning stars appear'd,
When light upon the orient shone,
And the sweet vale of Eden cheer'd!
The happy pair by thee were bless'd,
In innocence divinely dress'd.

Whate'er in social life endears
Is soften'd and refin'd by thee;
Beneath the weight of growing years
Thy pow'r preserves the spirits free:
All care before thy presence flies,
And joys within the bosom rise.

Thou art the lonely stranger's friend,
Who drinks the bitter cup of grief,
Whose secret sighs to heav'n ascend,
Who finds in tears a sweet relief;
A soother of the orphan's woe,
Who sorrow in this vale below."

It is, then, I repeat, to the development of religious truth that you have been for so many years devoted, and in which your investigations have been so successfully directed by the principles which we have specified. For in discarding those false guides, the creeds, confessions, opinions, and traditions of men, and in assuming, as your only director, the Scriptures of truth—that sacred Bible of which it was said by Locke that it "had God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter," you gave the best evidence of a determination to have the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. *The taking of the Scriptures as the only rule of faith and practice, and the subjecting these Scriptures to*

Digitized by Google

the ordinary rules of interpretation and the established laws of language, constitute the great pillars of the present reformation. These are the principles which have abolished textuary preaching, and broken up partial views of truth, the faith-alone systems of the day. It is these principles which have led to the exhibition of the gospel in all its original simplicity, order, beauty, and power. And it is these excellencies of the gospel, with its adaptation to the wants and circumstances of men, to which it owes its triumphs. We do not, then, underrate the systems of the day, when we affirm, that not one of them is Christianity, since nothing deserves to be called the truth which is not the whole truth, and the whole truth alone. Nor do we over estimate the value of the present reformation when we style it a return to primitive christianity—a restoration of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Upon reviewing the incidents of the past year, there are none to me so interesting as those consequent upon your introduction to W. Jones of London—an acquaintance, a blessed union and communion with our European brethren, and the re-publication in England of those writings which have in this country so successfully unmasked the corrupt systems of human theology and directed the attention of men to the living oracles of God. How providential that one like William Jones, who has beea an advocate for truth, and who, as the author of the "History of the Christian Church," of the "Waldenses and Albigenses," and other works, is so favorably known both in Europe and America, should be induced to employ the English press in behalf of christianity unfettered and disenthralled! How joyful the intelligence that this gospel is thus boldly declared among nations venerable for their antiquity, who have produced more illustrious men, and have done more to improve the moral, social, and political condition of men than all the world beside!

From these propitious circumstances, created, guided, and overruled by Divine Providence, we have reason to anticipate a rapid spread of christianity. The Press, that wonderful instrument, which has revolutionized society, and broken up the foundations of ignorance, bigotry, and superstition, is no less useful and efficient when employed to remove the confused and mingled mass which conceals the fair temple where Truth delights to dwell. This was fully exemplified in the publication of your Sermon on the Law, in which was made that important distinction between law and gospel which led to a subsequent development of the latter, and was also shown in the effect of your "Christian Baptist," which produced such a shaking amongst the rubbish, and contributed so much to bring to view the fair proportions of this building. In this great work the numerous other periodicals since established in different parts, have no doubt been more or less useful, some (if we may continue the figure) in cleaning out the apartments, and others *in brushing away the cobwebs*.

The press is indeed a mighty engine, and stands pre-eminent among the means by which the Truth has been disseminated.

Digitized by Google

But the bee has its sting and the rose its thorn, and while we rejoice in the influence of the Press we must not forget that whatever has ability to benefit has equal power to injure, and that the Press may be so poorly managed and its influence so misdirected that it will displease where it should delight, and wound where it should defend. That this has, in some measure, been the case with some of our periodicals during the past year, is unhappily true. A great degree of carelessness has been betrayed, unbecoming expressions admitted, unjust charges made, and unscriptural questions—subjects of debate and strife have been too often substituted for those things which promote peace on earth and good will among men. Nor is the pride of opinion and the love of speculation less evident or less to be deplored. On this account it is that the great principles in which the present reformation originated should be kept constantly in view by calling attention to them again and again. Oh! that each editor of a paper would leave his speculations and pay regard to that which the Lord has spoken—that he would abandon subjects of strife, political disquisitions, endeavor to spread the gospel, and teach the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Oh! that the Press in the coming year may be more than ever devoted to the service of Religion, and may fully repair the injury it has done, as the anointed spear is said to heal the wound which it inflicts, and the flesh of the viper becomes the antidote for its venom!

It is perhaps proper, that, after such "plainness of speech," I should drop the signatures of *Discipulus* and *Alumnus*, and "without a veil upon my face," sign myself yours for the truth's sake,

ROBERT RICHARDSON.

CARTHAGE, *Ohio*, November 3, 1835.

REFORMATION PERIODICALS.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER, by *Barton W. Stone*, Jacksonville, Illinois.

EVANGELIST, by *Walter Scott*, Carthage, Ohio.

APOSTOLIC ADVOCATE, by *John Thomas*, M. D. Richmond, Va.

GOSPEL ADVOCATE, by *J. T. Johnson*, Esq. and Dr. *Hall*, Georgetown, Kentucky.

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN, by *Silas E. Shepherd*, Auburn, New York.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, by *Wm. Hunter*, Eastport, Maine.

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER, by *A. Campbell*, Bethany, Va.

For the next year to them are to be added, by proposals now issued, THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER, by *D. S. Burnet*, Cincinnati, Ohio; and THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER, by *John R. Howard*, Paris, Tennessee. Also, THE DISCIPLE, by brethren *Butler* & *Graham*, of Alabama. I am not sure whether *C. F. R. Shehane* has commenced, or is about commencing a periodical in Georgia. A report to that effect has reached us.

That much good or evil may be done by the Press now in operation, as clearly and eloquently set forth in the remarks of our much esteemed and judicious brother *Richardson*, must be apparent to all the reflecting. That it might be much more profitably employed I have long been convinced; but unfortunately reform appears in this, as in all other matters, difficult. I am still endeavoring to be more useful, but am far from satisfying myself. Some pieces, in spite of all our vigilance, occasionally appear, which are not calcu-

Digitized by Google

lated to do good. We are very tired of controversy, and still more of that unkind, uncourteous, and proscriptive spirit which appears to be the genius of every sectarian establishment. I would, indeed, very gladly bestow one hundred volumes of the warmest religious controversy as a reward to that gentleman who would teach me how to contend for the doctrine of Christ without offending any person in the world. Offences must come; yet I think it more than probable that we occasion many more than the Lord calls for; and that, of all our earthly sufferings, the smallest share is for the sake of righteousness. Let us, then, brethren of the Press, all try to improve a little in our next volumes. I am willing to try. Let us all contend for the doctrine of Christ in the spirit of Christ. EDITOR.

RE-BAPTISM.

THIS subject has for some months occupied a prominent place in the *Apostolic Advocate*. I regret to see the matter agitated at this time, and on a view of all christendom so revolting to our feelings. Closing our volume for 1835, and for other reasons, we have not as yet complied with the request of brother *Thomas*, as to the republishing his pieces on that question. Indeed, I do not desire a discussion of such a matter at this crisis. I should have to accompany those pieces with strictures, which might operate in a direction and to an issue wholly unsuspected by our too sanguine friends. Let it be for the time being attributed to my cowardice, or to any other cause as probable, which the brethren please; but, in my judgment, this is not the time nor the place for such a discussion, nor is this *the work* to which we are at present called. It does not at all concern us; let us seek to convert sinners to the Lord, to edify the saints, and leave the weak and vascillating on this question to act as seemeth good to them, with out calling upon the whole community to discuss the subject, or to take a vote upon the question. EDITOR.

MR. MEREDITH.

FROM this gentleman we have not heard one word for two full moons. He has not republished in his paper, as we have seen, our last reply.—*Ed.*

APOLOGIES, QUERIES, AND COMPLAINTS.

MANY Queries have been forwarded to us, to which we cannot give other answers than those already published in some of our previous volumes. In our late Extra on *Order*, we have aimed at answering a score of questions on file. I hope we have done so to the satisfaction of our Querists. Several works sent us for review, never have yet been read. Amongst these are sundry pieces on Baptism—one by Mr. *Pitts*, of Nashville; and one by Mr. *Fairchild*, of Pennsylvania—the former a Methodist, the latter a Presbyterian Preacher. I may find time and spirit to read them during the next year. But neither of these gentleman can do more than reiterate what has been refuted a thousand times. Perhaps it may, for the sake of some, be expedient to refute some opinions a thousand and ten times. Were we to review every thing, and answer every question forwarded to us, we should never get out of the Primer of Christianity. EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

ELDER WILLIAM JONES, OF LONDON.

WE have had no communications from London for the last six weeks. A single letter from brother *W. Clark*, of BATH, England, is all that has been received from Britain during the last month. This letter informs us of the very comfortable circumstances of our brethren in that city. They have been chiefly collected out of the Episcopal Church of England, and out of the Wesleyan Methodist connexion, and number about forty. EDITOR.

PROPOSALS,

For publishing by subscription, in Paris, Tennessee, a religious periodical, to be titled THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER; *to be edited and conducted by* JOHN R. HOWARD.

PROSPECTUS.

The object to which it is intended to devote this work, shall be, as its name imports, *religious reformation*, in the evangelical and orthodox sense of that term; from error in faith and practice on the one hand, and vice, irreligion, and infidelity on the other.

In his endeavors to aid in effecting this, the Editor intends to proceed upon the principle acknowledged by the members of all parties who profess the Christian Religion—that "the Scriptures are the only and sufficient rule of the faith and practice of Christians."

To the BIBLE, therefore, as the only perfect standard of orthodoxy and test of truth, he will bring the doctrines and practices which claim its sanction and go under the name of religion; and *fearlessly* and *independently* advocate TRUTH and expose ERROR, wherever found and under whatever garb manifested.

Subservient to this design, the outlines of which are here sketched, the following subjects are the most prominent and will claim chief attention:—

1. The first and general principles of the Christian Religion, involving all that is necessary and requisite in doctrine and practice, will be advocated, illustrated, and enjoined, as set forth and exhibited in the Living Oracles, or New Testament.

2. The design with which the different parts of the Bible were written by the individuals to whom they are attributed, the genuineness of authorship, with the analysis and outline, in whole and part, of the books of which it is composed, will be attended to.

3. The evidences of the divine authenticity of Christianity will be exhibited and illustrated, and its claims upon the faith and obedience of all mankind, shown and urged; while the arguments of infidelity will be met and opposed, its system unveiled, and its conduct laid open and exposed.

4. The fulfilment of prophecy, as connected with the events in the history of the world and with Christian evidences, will also be shown; together with its office and design in influencing the actions and conduct of mankind.

5. The important bearing of education, physical, mental, moral, and religious, upon the present and future welfare, happiness, and fate of the human race, shall receive deserving attention; while the errors and deficiencies of the different systems will be pointed out, and the proper remedies proposed and illustrated.

6. Notices and reviews of such religious works and publications as come within the sphere of the Editor's design.

7. Notices of the success and progress of christian reform, religious news and intelligence, and miscellanea of religious, moral, and literary varieties, original and selected.

Digitized by Google

An apology may seem necessary in offering the Prospectus of a new religious periodical to the public for their patronage and support, while there are so many publishing already and others springing into existence. To assist in doing all the good he can, is the Editor's principal apology. Added to this, the misrepresentations, calumnies, and slanders, constantly issuing from the press, pulpit, and fireside, demand refutation and exposure; together with the repeated attempts persisted in to suppress truth and uphold and sustain error. Besides, Tennessee has no periodical devoted, in all respects, to the objects contemplated in this. To the brethren in this state he shall first look for aid in his undertaking, confident that they can sustain it if they will.

CONDITIONS.

1. Each number of this work shall contain 32 large duodecimo or small octavo pages, printed on a super-royal or imperial sheet of fair fine paper, with a variety of good type, stitched, and in a good cover.

2. It shall be issued monthly, on the first Monday of the month, commencing with January, 1836.

3. The price, exclusive of postage, shall be *One Dollar and Fifty Cents* in advance, *One Dollar and Seventy-five Cents* if not paid within six months after subscribing, and *Two Dollars* if not paid before the expiration of a year.

4. All persons who obtain and pay for TEN subscribers, according to these terms, shall receive *one* copy gratis.

5. Post-Masters and others who act as agents shall receive ten per cent. on all monies collected and remitted.

6. All subscriptions to commence with the year, and none received for less than one year; and no person permitted to withdraw until all arrearages are paid, unless at the discretion of the Editor.

7. A failure to notify a discontinuance will be considered a new engagement, where such notification is not received at least a month before the expiration of the year.

All letters and communications to be addressed to the Editor, Paris, Henry county, Tennessee, *(post paid)*—letters containing *remittances* excepted, at the Editor's expense.

☞ The Post-Office of each subscriber should be carefully named. Persons procuring subscribers will please obtain none but such as are solvent and punctual.

[I have no doubt but that brother Howard will be able to make his paper useful and interesting, and that he will be a strong ally in the cause of the Apostles' doctrine. He has been a large and liberal contributor to this paper. We have often regretted that we could not always find room for his frequent and valuable communications.]—*Ed. M. H.*

THE DISCIPLE.

The disciple is not above his teacher; but every finished disciple shall be as his teacher. If you persevere in my doctrine, you are my disciples indeed. And you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. JESUS CHRIST.

A contrast between primitive and modern Christianity will show the excellence of the former. The spirit of prophecy predicted, and the pen of history has recorded a shameful departure from the simplicity and purity of apostolic doctrine and practice. Professed disciples of Christ are turned away from the truth and the favor which came by him, and are following opinions and schemes of human origin.

No discipline can be so salutary as the New Testament, and no society so great a blessing to mankind as a christian congregation. No civil calamity, no single vice, however prevalent and destructive, is to be so much deprecated as the forfeiture of God's philanthropy and protection by a general irreverence to his word.

It is proposed by *James A. Butler* and *A. Graham* to publish a periodical under the above title, which will advocate a restoration of the primitive christian faith, worship, and morals.

Digitized by Google

The Disciple will be purely a religious work. It will carefully avoid any interference in politics, and will countenance none of the ycleped benevolent societies of the day, considering the undefiled, unmixed religion of Christ a subject of importance meriting its undivided attention.

The matter will be, generally, selected and original essays, developing the principles of the religious reformation, which we have been pleading, for some time, in this state. Well written pieces, for or against our sentiments, will be admitted on our pages.

The doctrine of Jesus Christ, as taught in the writings of his Evangelists and Apostles, will be contended for, in opposition to the "doctrines and commandments of men," or the theory of any man. The square shall not be altered to the timber, but the timber to the square. No human creed shall have the precedence of the Bible; but the Word of God shall be the standard.

It is hoped that the liberal citizens of Alabama will not condemn unheard, but give us that patronage which will secure the continuance of the work for several years.

TERMS.—*The Disciple* will be published monthly at the Office of the "Flag of the Union," Tuscaloosa. It will be neatly printed on good paper, with small type, and contain 24 pages in each number, making in the year a volume of 288 pages. The subscription price will be $2,00, paid within the year, which will be cheap for the size and quality of the work. Any person paying for ten copies shall have the eleventh gratis. The first number will appear in January, 1836. Communications addressed to *Graham & Butler*, Tuscaloosa, *post paid*, will receive attention.

[I know of no brother in the great valley of the Mississippi, whose zeal and devotion, superadded to intelligence, is more deserving of the hearing and patronage of those favorable to the cause we plead, than brother Butler of Alabama. His associate in the proposed publication, we understand, is also well furnished for the good work. I have waited for an interval in the birth of periodicals to make some remarks upon this subject; but must defer making them so long as we have any new one starting into life.]—ED. M. H.

CONCLUSION OF VOLUME VI.

WE promise our subscribers another volume of the *Millennial Harbinger*, if the Lord permit; and whether more than another will be issued, is extremely problematical. We thank our numerous patrons for their continued support of the establishment. On our list are many worthy names of *thirteen years'* continuance, and still there are many new ones. We have issued more copies of this work during the last year, than in any one year since our commencement. Our labors are very arduous, and we would gladly diminish them somewhat, were it not for the demands of our beloved brethren and generous friends, scattered throughout the land, and our obligations to do all we can for the cause of our Redeemer. We wish to be diligent while we can do any thing. The day is far spent with us, and the night approaches in which we can do nothing. Time is but the seed-time for the harvest of eternity; and we are sure if we sow sparingly, sparingly we shall reap. We do not wish to flag in the good combat of faith, being assured that in due time we shall reap if we faint not. Having said so much in the article headed *The Crisis*, and brother Richardson having suggested so many useful reflections in his *Reminiscences* of the past, we only add our request that all our fellow-laborers carefully consider these matters; and may the good Lord give us all a good understanding in all things!

EDITOR.

Digitized by Google

INDEX TO VOL. VI.

A

Ancient Order of Things at Geneva 557

B

Ballantine, Elder William, letter from, to the church in Bank street, Philadelphia 176
Ballantine, Elder William, letter from the church in Somerset, Pa. to 561
Ballantine's, Elder William, answer to 562
" " " letter to the editor 563
Baptist Missionary Convention of N. York 99
" Editor's Proposition to 370
" Inhospitality 426
" Banner 572

C

Calumny refuted 288
Challenge accepted 420
Change of Heart, of Conscience, and of State 211
Charity 174
Christian Baptist 91
" " and Christianity Restored 275
" " " New Music Book 336
" Investigator, Prospectus of 191
" Reformer, Proposals for 620
" Preacher, Prospectus of, by D. S. Burnet 576
Christianity, 160
Christianity Restored, 93
Church at Mount Vernon, Woodford county, Kentucky 94
Church Order 401

D

Deacon's Office 507
Definition of the term Order 484
Dispensation, change of 602
Disciple, proposals for publishing 621

E

Effect of Good Teaching 559
Essays on Education, No. I. 20—No. II. 63
No. III. 139—No. IV. 152—No. V. 224
Evangelist, the term 237
" as respects the labors of 523
Evangelist, as respects the labors of, among the Baptized 526

F

Faith alone, and Dr. J. Fishback's Book 35, 204
" " by M. Winans, 380, 404

G

Gardner's Observations 571
Great Men doing Worse than Nothing 603

H

Henley, brother T. M, letter from 572

I & J

Inconsistency 47
Infidelity and Popery 140
Irving, Rev. Edward, death of 86
Jesuit's Oath 114
John's Immersion 325, 362, 545
Jones, Elder William, of London, letters to 16
77, 109, 302, 459, 551

L

Language, order of 484
Landis, Rev. R. W., of Delaware, on Acts 12th chapter and 16th verse 67
Landis, Rev. R. W.—again 81
Last Days 122
Leopold Institution. rules of 408
Letter from J. B., of N. York, to the Editor 94

A

Apologies, Queries, and Complaints 619

B

Baptism, order as respects 525
" Sherlock on 232
" Methodist Discipline on 455
Bishop of Chester 480
" as respects the ordination of 496
" the duties of 504
Blasphemy, a voice full of, from New Hampshire, 71
Bombast, genuine 370
Broaddus, Mr.—Good Conscience, Good Character 413

C

Church, organization of 493
" Voting in 511
" Worship 507
Churches, Sister 518
Clark, B. to A. Campbell on Regeneration 265
Clark, J., D. D. translator of Grotius 604
Clerical Presumption 336
" Skirmishing 273
Conversation in Father Goodal's family circle, at 'Squire Baxter's 72, 185
Conversation in Father Goodal's family circle, at Thomas Goodal's 422
Conformity to the World 427
Co-operation 119, 138
Creeds and Councils 252
Creed, new, and New Party 116
Crisis 595

D

Discourse, order as respects 486
" Didactic, 486
Discipline, 513
Domestic Happiness, 489

E

Evasions of Scripture 406
Everlasting Punishment, by Mr. Spencer 449
Reply to " 452
Evidences of the Gospel 197, 317, 470
Exhortation, order of 487
Experience—Regular Baptist 337

F

Fisher, a Camelion, 384

G

Grotius—and J. Clark, D. D. his translator 604

H

Howard, J. R., letter from T. C., to 206

I & J

Jones, Elder William, letters from 342, 437, 539
" " " 620
Jonah, three days and three nights in the stomach of the great fish 129
Joslin, J. T., letter from, to the Editor 240
Judaism 158

L

Licensed Slanderers 43
Locks for Meeting Houses 125
London 'Millennial Harbinger' 377, 575
London Missionary Society 574
Lord's Supper 274
Lynd's, Mr., Improved Logic 479

Digitized by Google

INDEX.

M

Mahometanism 154
M'Corkle, S. M., and the Prophecies, by a Reformed Clergyman, 322
M'Corkle's, S. M., replies to the Reformed Clergyman, 193, 245, 307, 365, 392, 433, 530, 577
Meredith, Mr., of North Carolina, and the Extras, 31, 369, 443
Meredith, Mr.,—waning, 311

O

Obituary Notices 45, 240, 284, 384, 575
Offences 218
Otey, Dr. James H., Bishop of Tennessee, Letters to, by the Editor 228, 241. 289, 357 396, 465, 590
Order, Extra on, 483
——— as respects Language, 484
——— as respects the Mind, 485
——— as respects Discourse, 486
——— as respects a Didactic Discourse, 486
——— as respects Exhortation, 487
——— as respects Prayer, 488
——— as respects Domestic Happiness, 489
——— as respects the Church, 491
——— as respects the Ordination of Bishops 496

P

Paul's Allusions to Ancient Customs 27, 85, 100
Philips, Revd. W., of Newport, Ky, letter to, from M. Winans, 379
Political Reverends, 594
Poor Encouragement for Publishers, 132
Pope, Letter of Approbation of the, 409
Popery, 116
" in America, 407
Prayer, order of, 488
Preachers, school of, 478
Preaching from Envy, 600
Preface, 3

Q

Queries, 48, 86, 383
Question on Regeneration, 173

R

Randolph, John, 287
Reform, progress of, 38, 141, 179, 276, 372, 429 475, 567, 608
Reformation, 134, 182, 282, 381, 472, 574
" a Personal Concern, 83
" and Restoration, a New Year's Gift for 1835, 24
Reformation Periodicals, 618
Reformed Clergyman, reply to, by S. M. M'Corkle, 193, 245, 307, 365, 392, 433, 530, 577
Reformed Clergyman, on the Millennium, 5 52, 102, 145
Re-immersion, 417
Re-immersion and brother Thomas, 565
Religious Controversy, 126
Religious Herald, of July 10th: Views of Mr. A. Campbell, 428
Religious Magazine, 154
Renunciation of Sectarianism by S. K. Hoshour, 398
Report of a meeting of the Messengers of thirteen Congregations at Wellsburg, 168
Report of a General Co-operation Meeting at Deavertowu, Ohio, 375
Re-baptism, 610
Reminiscences of 1835, 611
Romanism, 201, 385

S

Science and Literature, 131
Scotch Baptists in Britain—A word of Apology for—by Elder W. Jones, of London, 203
Sectarianism, Evils and Remedy of, 235, 436
Sects, the Word, and the Spirit, 457
Sermon on Ecclesiastes xi. 1. 120
Slavery and Anti-Slavery, 587
Son of Man, coming of, by M. Winans, 251
Speculatiou, 190
Spirit, Holy, operations of, 276
Stanzas, by Mrs. L. H. Sigourney, 48
State and Conversion of the Sects, 400
Study, no time for, 131

T

Temperance Associations, 388
Theory of Mr. Campbell, by Allen Crocker, of Brookville, New York, 136
Thomas, Dr. John, letter from, 86
Todd's Defence, 261
Tour of 75 days, sketch of, 277, 331
Tour to the East, 480

U

Union, 59
Union of the Disciples in the City of New York, 334

Volume VI. Conclusion of, 622

W

Welch Anecdote, 143
Wesleyan Methodist Reform Association, 535
Winan's, M., reply to J. B. of New York, 177
Winans, M., to Elder Henry Grew, 269
Worship, of a church order of, 507
Worship, Social, by I. W. Tener, 11
Reply to I. W. Tener, 14

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google